arXiv:1608.01864v1 [math.AP] 5 Aug 2016

On the convergence of fixed point iterations for the moving geometry in a fluid-structure interaction problem

Anna Hundertmark - Zaušková,
Johannes-Gutenberg University, Mainz, Germany

Abstract

In this paper a fluid-structure interaction problem for the incompressible Newtonian fluid is studied. We prove the convergence of an iterative process with respect to the computational domain geometry. In our previous works on numerical approximation of similar problems we refer this approach as the global iterative method [LZ08, HL10]. This iterative approach can be understood as a linearization of the so-called geometric nonlinearity of the underlying model. The proof of the convergence is based on the Banach fixed point argument, where the contractivity of the corresponding mapping is shown due to the continuous dependence of the weak solution on the given domain deformation. This estimate is obtained by remapping the problem onto a fixed domain and using appropriate divergence-free test functions involving the difference of two solutions.

keywords: fluid-structure interaction, fixed point method, continuous dependence on data, uniqueness, Banach fixed point theorem, hemodynamics, incompressible Newtonian fluid

1 Introduction

Mathematical analysis and numerical simulation of fluid-structure interaction (FSI) problems is an intensively studied part of the computational fluid dynamics. In FSI problems the computational domain deforms under the fluid forces. Thus, the domain deformation, governed by a structure equation, depends on the solution of the fluid equation. In the literature this dependence is referred as *the geometric nonlinearity*. One possible strategy

to find a solution to such coupled problem is a linearization of the problem with respect to the geometric nonlinearity. The problem is solved at first for a known domain, deforming according to a given, sufficiently smooth deformation. The second step is to prove the existence of a fixed point for the domain deformation.

In our previous work on this topic we proved the existence and uniqueness of the weak solution for an approximation of the fully coupled fluid-structure interaction problem for the Navier-Stokes equations and a parabolic (viscoelastic) equation for the boundary deformation, see [FZ08, Zau07]. Here a construction of the unknown domain through the iterative process with respect to the domain geometry has been proposed. For a semi-pervous approximation of the coupling condition, the convergence of this iterative process has been shown in [FZ08] using the Banach fixed point argument. However, it was not possible to prove the convergence of this iterative process for the fully coupled original problem due to the lack of regularity of the domain deformation.

Further results on the existence of a weak solution to the fully coupled FSI problem for the Newtonian fluid and a viscoelastic/elastic plate in 2D and 3D have been obtained by Grandmont et al. [CDEG05, Gra08]. In the case of a two-dimensional fluid flow and one-dimensional structure the authors obtained the existence of weak solution for the same regularity of the domain deformation as in [FZ08] using the Schauder fixed point argument, without giving any details on construction of the domain deformation and without providing the uniqueness of the solution. Using a similar fixed point procedure for the geometry the existence of weak solution for a fluid-structure interaction problem for a generalized power-law shear-dependent fluid including the Newtonian case has been shown in our recent works [LHN16, HLN16], see also, e.g., [Len14].

The continuous dependence of the weak solution on the initial data and the uniqueness have been shown for the incompressible Newtonian fluid by Padula et al. in [GGP12]. They considered transformation of the solution between two domains with different deformations, that preserves the solenoidal property of the solution. For further works on the mathematical analysis of similar FSI problems for the Newtonian as well as non-Newtonian fluids we refer also to [Bei04, GPPB08, CS06, CS10, Neu09, Leq11, LR14, Len14, ČM14, ČM16, MČ13b, MČ13a] and the references therein.

In this work we will deal with the geometric nonlinearity and study the iterative process with respect to the domain geometry for the fully coupled FSI problem presented in the following section.




Figure 1: Deformable computational domain

1.1 Mathematical model

We consider a fluid flow problem in a two-dimensional channel representing a longitudinal cut of a vessel. The fluid flow is governed by the momentum and the continuity equation, written in Cartesian coordinates for the sake of simplicity,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \boldsymbol{v} + \rho\,(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\nabla)\,\boldsymbol{v} - \operatorname{div}\big[2\frac{\mu}{\rho}(|e(\boldsymbol{v})|)e(\boldsymbol{v})\big] + \nabla p &= 0, \\ \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{v} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here ρ denotes the constant density of fluid, $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_1, v_2)^T$ the velocity vector, p the pressure and $e(\boldsymbol{v}) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\boldsymbol{v} + \nabla\boldsymbol{v}^T)$ the symmetric deformation tensor. We consider the viscosity μ to be constant.

The radial vessel wall deformation η is modelled using one-dimensional viscoelastic string model. The deformation η as a function of longitudinal variable x_1 and time t is governed by the following structure equation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}\rho\left[\frac{\partial^2\eta}{\partial t^2} - a\frac{\partial^2\eta}{\partial x_1^2} + b\eta + c\frac{\partial^5\eta}{\partial t\partial x_1^4} - a\frac{\partial^2 R_0}{\partial x_1^2}\right](x_1,t) = \\ \Big[-\mathbf{T}_f\boldsymbol{n}\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_2 - P_w\Big](x_1, R_0(x_1)+\eta(x_1,t),t), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$x_1 \in (0,L), t \in (0,T)$. Here $\mathcal{E} = \rho_w\hbar\sqrt{1+(\partial_{x_1}R_0)^2}$, where ρ_w is the density of the wall tissue and $\hbar$ its thickness. We assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is bounded and a, b, c are positive constants describing the mechanical properties of the vessel wall tissue. Further, $R_0(x_1)$ stands for the reference radius of the cylinder (vessel), P_w the external pressure acting on the deformable vessel wall and $\boldsymbol{n}$ the normal vector to the moving vessel wall. Similar models for the wall deformation have been considered in [CDEG05, MČ13a], see also [QTV00, Qua01, FGNQ00].

The moving wall deforms under the fluid action, thus the computational domain for fluid is determined by the unknown deformation η, i.e.,

$$\Omega(\eta(t)) \equiv \{(x_1, x_2);\ 0 < x_1 < L,\ 0 < x_2 < R_0(x_1) + \eta(x_1, t)\},\ 0 < t < T,$$

where $R_0(x_1)$, referred as reference radius above, describes the reference position of the deformable wall. The boundary of $\Omega(\eta(t))$ consists of one moving part $\Gamma_w(t)$,

$$\Gamma_w(t) \equiv \{(x_1, x_2);\ x_2 = R_0(x_1) + \eta(x_1, t),\ x_1 \in (0, L)\},$$

and three fixed boundaries Γ_{in}, Γ_{out} and Γ_c denoting the inflow, the outflow and the bottom boundary, respectively, see Fig. 1.1.

The fluid problem (1) and the structure equation (2) are coupled through the natural kinematic condition describing the continuity of velocities on the moving interface $\Gamma_w(t)$,

$$\boldsymbol{v}\big(x_1, R_0(x_1) + \eta(x_1, t), t\big) = \big(0, \partial_t \eta(x_1, t)\big). \tag{3}$$

Moreover, the external force causing the wall deformation arises due to the fluid stress. Thus, the second coupling condition, expresssed by the right hand side of (2), has dynamical character and can be understood as the continuity of stresses.

We complete the system (1)–(3) with Neumann-type boundary conditions with kinematic pressure at the inflow Γ_{in} and outflow boundary Γ_{out},

$$\left(2\mu(|e(\boldsymbol{v})|)\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x_1} - p + P_{in} - \frac{\rho}{2}|v_1|^2\right)(0, x_2, t) = 0, \quad v_2(0, x_2, t) = 0, \tag{4}$$

$$\left(2\mu(|e(\boldsymbol{v})|)\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x_1} - p + P_{out} - \frac{\rho}{2}|v_1|^2\right)(L, x_2, t) = 0, \quad v_2(L, x_2, t) = 0. \tag{5}$$

Here P_{in}, P_{out} are some given pressures and $0 < x_2 < R_0(\tilde{x_1}) + \eta(\tilde{x_1}, t)$ with $\tilde{x_1} = 0, L$. On the bottom boundary Γ_c the flow symmetry is considered,

$$v_2(x_1, 0, t) = 0\ , \quad \mu(|e(\boldsymbol{v})|)\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x_2}(x_1, 0, t) = 0, \quad 0 < x_1 < L,\ 0 < t < T. \tag{6}$$

We equippe equation (2) with the following clamped boundary conditions,

$$\eta(0, t) = \eta(L, t) = 0, \qquad \eta_{x_1}(0, t) = \eta_{x_1}(L, t) = 0. \tag{7}$$

The initial conditions for the fluid (1) and structure (2) equations read as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{v}(x_1, x_2, 0) &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for any } 0 < x_1 < L, \\ &\qquad\qquad 0 < x_2 < R_0(x_1), \\ \eta(x_1, 0) = \eta_{x_1}(x_1, 0) = \eta_t(x_1, 0) &= 0 \quad \text{for any } 0 < x_1 < L. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The problem (1)–(8) represents a mathematical model for the incompressible Newtonian fluid flow in a deformable domain, where the deformation of the upper wall obeys the viscoelastic string model. It is a fully coupled fluid-structure interaction problem that can be used in hemodynamics to model the blood flow in (large) elastic vessels. The geometry of computational domain $\Omega(\eta)$ depends on unknown solution η.

As already mentioned, one possible and commonly used way to show the existence result for such fully coupled FSI problems is to linearize the problem with respect to the geometric nonlinearity and consequently to find a fixed point of this nonlinearity. At the beginning a smooth enough domain deformation function δ is given. The computational domain is approximated by this function, $\Omega(\eta) \approx \Omega(\delta)$. Further, existence of a weak solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \eta)$ defined on $\Omega(\delta)$ is proven. Finally a fixed point of the mapping $\mathcal{F}(\delta) = \eta$ defined by the weak formulation on $\Omega(\delta)$ is found. By applying the Schauder fixed point argument for the mapping $\mathcal{F}$ it can be shown that at least one $\eta^\star$ s.t. $\eta^\star = \mathcal{F}(\eta^\star)$ exists. Furthermore, if the assumptions of the Banach fixed point argument are satisfied, the uniqueness of the fixed point and the convergence of the iterative process $\mathcal{F}(\eta^{k-1}) = \eta^k$ can be obtained additionally. The Banach fixed point theorem is based on the contractivity of the mapping $\mathcal{F}$, which in our case follows from the continuous dependence of the weak solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \eta)$ on the given domain deformation function δ.

Let us note that in [FZ08] the convergence of above described iterative process and uniqueness of the fixed point has been obtained only for a semi-pervous and pseudo-compressible approximation of the original fluid-structure interaction problem. Here the right hand side of structure equation (2) has been replaced by $\kappa(v_2 - \eta_t)$ for a fixed $\kappa \in R$. This imply more regularity for η than in the original case. The continuous dependence on data and consequently the contractivity of the fixed point mapping has been shown in [FZ08] only for non-solenoidal solutions and fixed κ. We would like to point out here, that by letting $\kappa \to \infty$ the original coupled problem with conditions (2), (3) can be obtained. However, existence of the weak solution for this case has been studied in [FZ08] only for the known domain $\Omega(\delta)$.

A significant difficulty in the proof of continuous dependence on data for the incompressible fluids lies in the requirement of divergence-free test functions involving the difference of two solution defined in two different domains. One has to test with transformed solutions, as in [GGP12]. As a consequence, the matrix of the transformation between two domains is contained in the terms to be estimated. This leads to technical difficulties when fluid is considered to be non-Newtonian, e.g., fluid the shear-dependent viscosity following the power-law $\mu(|e(\boldsymbol{v})|) = \mu(1 + |e(\boldsymbol{v})|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}$, $p > 1$. The application of the Banach fixed point argument for FSI problems for power-

law fluids is up to our knowledge an open problem.

The main goal of this paper is to show the convergence of the above described iterative process for the Newtonian fluid. Here we prove the essential estimate for the continuous dependence on data and then we apply the Banach fixed point theorem to show the convergence of this iterative method, which has not yet been done for the fully coupled FSI problems up to our knowledge. As a consequence we also get uniqueness of the weak solution. We refer this iterative process as *the global iterative method with respect to the domain deformation* and use it in our numerical approximation of the proposed problem, see, e.g., [LZ08, HL10]. In these numerical studies the convergence of this iterations has been observed experimentally. The present paper provides the first theoretical proof of this convergence for incompressible Newtonian fluids.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the linearization of the problem (1)–(8) with respect to the so-called geometric nonlinearity and present known results on the existence of weak solutions on a given deformable domain $\Omega(\delta)$. In Section 3 we derive the estimate on continuous dependence of the weak solution on the boundary pressure and the given deformation. This estimate is formulated in Theorem 3.1. Finally, in Section 4 we apply the Banach fixed point theorem and prove the convergence of the global iterative method.

2 Linearization with respect to domain geometry $\Omega(h)$

In order to linearize the problem with respect to the geometric nonlinearity we assume to have a given deformation function $\delta(x_1,t) \in H^1(0,T;H_0^2(0,L)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(0,L))$. We denote $h := R_0 + \delta,\ R_0(x_1) \in C^2[0,L]$, and assume

$$0 < \alpha \le h(x_1,t) \le \alpha^{-1}, \quad \left|\frac{\partial h(x_1,t)}{\partial x_1}\right| + \int_0^T \left|\frac{\partial h(x_1,t)}{\partial t}\right|^2 dt \le K \tag{9}$$

for given constants $\alpha > 0$, $K > 0$. We consider a time dependent domain, which deforms according to the given function δ, i.e. we approximate $\Omega(\eta) \approx \Omega(\delta) =: \Omega(h)$. Due to this approximation the geometric coupling in the original fluid-structure interaction problem (1)–(8) has been decoupled.

2.1 Existence of weak solution

Existence of weak solution of the problem (1)–(8) defined on the given domain with deformation δ, i.e. on $\Omega(h)$ has been shown in [LHN16, Theorem 5.1].

More precisely, for boundary pressures[1] $q_{in}, q_{out} \in L^2(0,T;L^2(0,1))$ and $q_w \in L^2(0,T;L^2(0,L))$ there exists a weak solution $(\boldsymbol{u},\eta)$, where $\boldsymbol{u}$ denotes the transformed fluid velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ into the rectangular domain D,

$$D \equiv (0,L)\times(0,1),$$

i.e., $\boldsymbol{u}(y_1,y_2,t) \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \boldsymbol{v}(y_1,h(y_1,t)y_2,t)$, $y_1 = x_1$, $y_2 = x_2/h(x_1,t)$, $y \in D, x \in \Omega(h)$ with following properties:

i) $(\boldsymbol{u},\eta) \in [L^p(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \times H^1(0,T;H_0^2(0,L))] \cap [L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D)) \times W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(0,L))]$,

ii) the ALE (Arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian) distributive time derivative $\bar\partial_t(h\boldsymbol{u}) = \frac{\partial(h\boldsymbol{u})}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{h}\frac{\partial h}{\partial t}\frac{\partial(y_2 h\boldsymbol{u})}{\partial y_2}$ belongs to $L^2(0,T;X^*) \oplus L^{4/3}((0,T)\times D)$ and

$$\int_0^T\int_D \left\{ h\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\psi}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial t}\frac{\partial(y_2\boldsymbol{u})}{\partial y_2}\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}\right\} dy\,dt = -\int_0^T \left\langle \bar\partial_t(h\boldsymbol{u}),\boldsymbol{\psi}\right\rangle_X dt,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
X &= \{\boldsymbol{\psi}\in \boldsymbol{V}_{div}\,;\ \boldsymbol{\psi}_2\big|_{S_w} \in H_0^2(0,L)\}, && (10)\\
\boldsymbol{V}_{div} &\equiv \big\{\boldsymbol{w}\in W^{1,2}(D) : \mathrm{div}_h\boldsymbol{w} = 0 \ a.e.\ \text{on } D, && (11)\\
&\qquad w_1 = 0 \ \text{on } S_w \text{ and } w_2 = 0 \ \text{on } S_{in}\cup S_{out}\cup S_c\big\},\\
S_w &= \{(y_1,1) : 0<y_1<L\}, \qquad S_{in} = \{(0,y_2) : 0<y_2<1\},\\
S_{out} &= \{(L,y_2) : 0<y_2<1\}, \qquad S_c = \{(y_1,0) : 0<y_1<L\},
\end{aligned}$$

iii) $\boldsymbol{u}$ satisfies the transformed divergence-free condition

$$\mathrm{div}_h\boldsymbol{u} \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y_1} - \frac{y_2}{h}\frac{\partial h}{\partial y_1}\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y_2} + \frac{1}{h}\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y_2} = 0 \ \text{ a.e. on } D, \qquad (12)$$

iv) $u_2(y_1,1,t) = \partial_t\eta(y_1,t)$ for a.e. $y_1\in(0,L)$, $t\in(0,T)$,
and the following integral identity holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_0^T \left\langle \bar\partial_t(h\boldsymbol{u}),\boldsymbol{\psi}\right\rangle_X + \left\langle \partial_t\eta_t,\xi\right\rangle dt + \int_0^T\Big\{ ((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\psi}))_h + b_h(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\psi}) + \qquad (13)\\
&\int_0^1 h(L)q_{out}(y_2)\psi_1(L,y_2) - h(0)q_{in}(y_2,t)\psi_1(0,y_2)\,dy_2 +\\
&\int_0^L \big(q_w + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial h}{\partial t}u_2\big)\psi_2(y_1,1) + c\,\frac{\partial^3\eta}{\partial t\partial y_1^2}\frac{\partial^2\xi}{\partial y_1^2} + a\frac{\partial\eta}{\partial y_1}\frac{\partial\xi}{\partial y_1} - a\frac{\partial^2 R_0}{\partial y_1^2}\xi + b\eta\xi\,dy_1\Big\}\,dt
\end{aligned}$$

[1] In view of the transformation onto D we have $q_{in}(0,y_2,t) = P_{in}(0,x_2,t)$, $q_{out}(L,y_2,t) = P_{out}(L,x_2,t)$, $q_w(y_1,1,t) = P_w(x_1,h(x_1,t),t)$.

for every test function

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H^1(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}),\ \boldsymbol{\psi}_2\big|_{S_w} \in H^1(0,T;H_0^2(0,L)),\ \boldsymbol{\psi}(y,0)=0, \quad (14)\\ &\mathrm{div}_h\,\boldsymbol{\psi}=0 \quad a.e.\ \text{on } D,\\ &\text{and} \quad \xi(x_1,t)=E\,\boldsymbol{\psi}_2(y_1,1,t).\end{aligned}$$

In (13) the following notations for the transformed viscous and convective terms have been used:

$$((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\psi}))_h := \frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_D h\hat{e}_h(\boldsymbol{u}) : \hat{e}_h(\boldsymbol{\psi})dy, \quad (\hat{e}_h(\boldsymbol{u}))_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\partial}_i(u_j)+\hat{\partial}_j(u_i)), \quad (15)$$

$$\text{where } \hat{\partial}_1 = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} - \frac{y_2}{h}\frac{\partial h}{\partial y_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2}\right), \quad \hat{\partial}_2 = \frac{1}{h}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2},$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_h(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{\psi}) \;:=\; & \int_D \left(hu_1\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{z}}{\partial y_1} - \frac{y_2}{h}\frac{\partial h}{\partial y_1}\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{z}}{\partial y_2}\right) + u_2\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{z}}{\partial y_2}\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}\,dy \\ & -\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 R_0 u_1 z_1 \psi_1\,(L,y_2)\,dy_2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 R_0 u_1 z_1\psi_1\,(0,y_2)\,dy_2 \\ & -\frac{1}{2}\int_0^L u_2 z_2\psi_2\,(y_1,1)\,dy_1. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Using the integration by parts the following property of the trilinear form can be proven, see [LHN16, Lemma 3.7],

$$\begin{aligned} b_h(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{\psi}) \;&=\; \frac{1}{2}B_h(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{\psi}) - \frac{1}{2}B_h(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\psi},\boldsymbol{z}), \quad (17)\\ \text{where} \quad B_h(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{\psi}) \;&:=\; \int_D \left(hu_1\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{z}}{\partial y_1} - \frac{y_2}{h}\frac{\partial h}{\partial y_1}\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{z}}{\partial y_2}\right) + u_2\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{z}}{\partial y_2}\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}\,dy. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for the distributive time derivative of our weak solution $\boldsymbol{u}$ described above holds:

$$\int_0^T \left\langle \bar{\partial}_t(h\boldsymbol{u}),\boldsymbol{u}\right\rangle_X dt = \frac{1}{2}\int_D |\boldsymbol{u}|^2(T)h(T) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^L \partial_t h|u_2|^2 dy_1 dt, \quad (18)$$

see [LHN16, Section 4.2.1 and Appendix A].

3 Continuous dependence on domain deformation

In this section we prove, that the weak solution is continuously dependent on the boundary pressure data $q_{in/out/w}$ as well as on the domain deformation h.

The last dependence will be very useful to show the contractivity of the fixed point mapping defined by the iterative process with respect to the domain, that will be studies in Section 4.

To obtain the continuous dependence estimate we employ test functions involving the difference of two solutions $\boldsymbol{u}^1$, $\boldsymbol{u}^2$. Unfortunately, due to the dependency of the divergence operator on h, cf. (12), the difference $\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2$ is not divergence-free. More precisely, neither $\mathrm{div}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2) = 0$, nor $\mathrm{div}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2) = 0$. This is related to the deformability of the domain and the fact that $\boldsymbol{v}^1$ is divergence-free in $\Omega(h^1)$ and $\boldsymbol{v}^2$ is divergence-free in $\Omega(h^2)$, i.e., with respect to another coordinates. In order to design admissible test functions, see Section 3.1, the first solution is transformed into the definition domain of the second solution. Similar technique has been previously used in [GGP12] to prove the continuous dependence of the weak solution on initial data for similar problems in two dimensions using the Eulerian coordinates. In comparison to [GGP12], our problem is moreover remapped to the reference fixed domain D. After rewriting the weak formulation by means of the admissible test functions, see Section 3.1, diverse error terms arise. Their estimates can be found in Section 3.2. In Section 3.3 we present the final estimate, which yields the main result of Section 3, the continuous dependence of the weak solution on the domain deformation h and boundary pressures q_{in}, q_{out}, q_w formulated in the following theorem:

Theorem (Continuous dependence on data)**.**
Let $(\boldsymbol{u}^1, \eta^1)$, $(\boldsymbol{u}^2, \eta^2)$ be two weak solutions of the initial boundary value problem (1)–(8) transformed to the rectangular fixed domain D satisfying (13). Let the corresponding domain deformation be given by some functions h^1, h^2 satisfying (9). Let the transformed boundary pressures $q^1_{in/out/w}$ and $q^2_{in/out/w}$ belong to $L^2(0,T;L^2(S_{in/out/s}))$, respectively. Then for almost all $t \in (0,T)$ it holds:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}(t) + \frac{\alpha\mu}{2\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko}\int_0^t \|\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}ds \\
&+\frac{E}{2}\|\eta^1_t - \eta^2_t\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t) + \frac{bE}{2}\|\eta^1 - \eta^2\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t) + \frac{aE}{2}\|\eta^1_{y_1} - \eta^2_{y_1}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t) \\
&\quad +cE\int_0^t \|\eta^1_t - \eta^2_t\|^2_{H^2(0,L)}ds \\
&\leq C_7\left(\int_0^t \|q^1_{in} - q^2_{in}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)} + \|q^1_{out} - q^2_{out}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)} + \|q^1_w - q^2_w\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}ds\right. \\
&\qquad \left. +\omega(t)\left[\|h^1 - h^2\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,t;L^2(0,L))} + \|h^1 - h^2\|^2_{L^\infty(0,t;H^2(0,L))}\right]\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$\omega(t) = \int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|^2_{X^*} + \|h^1_t\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,L)} + \|h^2_t\|^2_{L^\infty(D)} ds \quad \textit{and} \quad \omega(t) \downarrow 0 \quad \textit{for} \quad t \downarrow 0.$$

Here $\tilde{c}_{Ko}$ is the coercivity constant of the viscous form coming from the Korn inequality, α, K are given by (9), μ, ρ, E, a, b, c are given by the physical model and C_7 is a constant dependent on $\alpha^{-1}, K, \tilde{c}^{-1}_{Ko}$ and on the norms $\|h^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}$, $\|\boldsymbol{u}^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$, $i = 1, 2$. The matrix $\mathbb{R}$ in the above estimate arises due to transformation of weak solution from $\Omega(h^1)$ to $\Omega(h^2)$.

3.1 Admissible test functions

To prove the above theorem let us assume $(\boldsymbol{u}^1, \eta^1), (\boldsymbol{u}^2, \eta^2)$ are two weak solutions of our problem transformed onto a fixed reference domain D, both satisfying the weak formulation (13) with h^1, h^2, respectively.

Before we subtract (13) for both solution sets we provide some preliminaries concerning admissible test functions (14), involving a difference of the two weak solutions. Let us denote the matrix of the transformation of variables between $\Omega(h^1)$ and $\Omega(h^2)$ by $\mathbb{J} = \frac{dX}{dx}$, $X \in \Omega(h^1)$, $x \in \Omega(h^2)$ and the inverse matrix by $\mathbb{J}^{-1}$. They both expressed in the reference coordinates $y \in D$ read,

$$\mathbb{J} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ y_2 h^2 \partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2}) & \frac{h^1}{h^2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbb{J}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ y_2 h^1 \partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^2}{h^1}) & \frac{h^2}{h^1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathbb{R} := J\mathbb{J}^{-1}$, where $J = |\mathbb{J}|$ is the determinant of the transformation matrix $\mathbb{J}$. We have $J = h^1/h^2$ and

$$\mathbb{R} = J\mathbb{J}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{h^1}{h^2} & 0 \\ -y_2 h^2 \partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2}) & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbb{R}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{h_2}{h_1} & 0 \\ -y_2 h^1 \partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^2}{h^1}) & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

Next step is design admissible divergence-free test function according to (14), that contain a difference of the two weak solutions. To this end we consider two sets of test functions for the fluid velocity

$$\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\psi}^1 = \boldsymbol{u}^1 - \mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}^2, \qquad \boldsymbol{\psi}^2 = \mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2, \\ \text{i.e.,} \quad & \boldsymbol{\psi}^1 = \mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \qquad \boldsymbol{\psi}^2 = \mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{\psi}^1. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

It holds that $\mathrm{div}_{h^2}\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 = 0$. Indeed, since $\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 = \big[\frac{h^1}{h^2}u^1_1, -y_2 h^2 \partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})u^1_1 +$

$u_2^1\big]^T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{div}_{h^2}\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}\left(\tfrac{h^1}{h^2}u_1^1\right) - \frac{y_2}{h^2}\partial_{y_1}h^2\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2}\left(\tfrac{h^1}{h^2}u_1^1\right) + \frac{1}{h^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2}\left(u_2^1 - y_2h^2\partial_{y_1}\big(\tfrac{h^1}{h^2}\big)u_1^1\right)\\ &= \tfrac{h^1}{h^2}\partial_{y_1}u_1^1 - \frac{y_2}{h^2}\partial_{y_1}h^2\tfrac{h^1}{h^2}\partial_{y_2}u_1^1 + \frac{1}{h^2}\partial_{y_2}u_2^1 - y_2\partial_{y_1}\big(\tfrac{h^1}{h^2}\big)\partial_{y_2}u_1^1\\ &= \tfrac{h^1}{h^2}\partial_{y_1}u_1^1 + \frac{1}{h^2}\partial_{y_2}u_2^1 - \frac{y_2}{h^2}\partial_{y_2}u_1^1\partial_{y_1}h^1 = \tfrac{h^1}{h^2}\mathrm{div}_{h^1}\boldsymbol{u}^1,\end{aligned}$$

cf. (12). We got $\mathrm{div}_{h^2}\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 = J\mathrm{div}_{h^1}\boldsymbol{u}^1 \equiv 0$. Analogously one can easily show $\mathrm{div}_{h^1}\mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}^2 = J^{-1}\mathrm{div}_{h^2}\boldsymbol{u}^2 = 0$. Thus

$$\mathrm{div}_{h^1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^1 = \mathrm{div}_{h^2}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 = 0,$$

i.e., $\boldsymbol{\psi}^i$ is solenoidal with respect to $\Omega(h^i)$ for both $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, since the first component of the velocity $u_1^i|_{S_w} = 0$ we have $\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1|_{S_w} = [0, u_2^1]^T$, similarly $\mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}^2|_{S_w} = [0, u_2^2]^T$. Thus the trace of $\boldsymbol{\psi}^i$ on S_w is equal to $[0, u_2^1 - u_2^2]^T$ for both $i = 1, 2$, and due to $u_2^i|_{S_w} = \eta_t^i$ a.e., we obtain $\psi_2^i|_{S_w} = \eta_t^1 - \eta_t^2$. Consequently, the test functions $(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1, \xi)$, $(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \xi)$ from (20) with $\xi = E\eta_t^1 - E\eta_t^2$ are admissible.

Now we subtract the weak formulation (13) for $(\boldsymbol{u}^1, \eta^1)$ with test function $(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1, \xi)$ and for $(\boldsymbol{u}^2, \eta^2)$ with test function $(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \xi)$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0 = &\int_0^T \left\langle \bar\partial_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^1\right\rangle_X - \left\langle \bar\partial_t^{h^2}(h^2\boldsymbol{u}^2), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\right\rangle_X dt \qquad (21)\\ &+ \int_0^T ((\boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^1))_{h^1} - ((\boldsymbol{u}^2, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2))_{h^2} + b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^1) - b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2, \boldsymbol{u}^2, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\, dt\\ &+ \frac{1}{2E}\int_0^L |\xi|^2(T) + \frac{aE}{2}\left|\partial_{y_1}\bar\eta\right|^2(T) + \frac{bE}{2}|\bar\eta|^2(T) + \frac{c}{E}\int_0^T\int_0^L |\partial_{y_1}^2\xi|^2 dt\\ &+ \int_0^T\int_0^1 q_{in}^1h^1\psi_1^1(0, y_2) - q_{in}^2h^2\psi_1^2(0, y_2) + q_{out}^1h^1\psi_1^1(L, y_2) - q_{out}^2h^2\psi_1^2(L, y_2)dy_2\\ &+ \int_0^L (q_w^1 + \frac{\partial_t h^1}{2}u_2^1)\psi_2^1(y_1, 1) - (q_w^2 + \frac{\partial_t h^2}{2}u_2^2)\psi_2^2(y_1, 1)dy_1\, dt,\end{aligned}$$

with the notation $\bar\eta := \eta^1 - \eta^2$.

In what follows we rewrite the above equality with respect to the test function $\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$, i.e., we express all terms using $\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$ and additional (error) terms.
Time derivative terms: Since $\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 = \mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1 = \mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$ we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle \bar\partial_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^1\right\rangle_X - \left\langle \bar\partial_t^{h^2}(h^2\boldsymbol{u}^2), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\right\rangle_X =\\ &\left\langle \bar\partial_t^{h^2}(h^2\boldsymbol{\psi}^2), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\right\rangle_X + \left\langle \bar\partial_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\right\rangle_X - \left\langle \bar\partial_t^{h^2}(h^2\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\right\rangle_X.\end{aligned}$$

After this reformulation we can apply the property of the ALE distributive time derivative (18) for the first term on the right hand side of the last equality. Because of the coupling between the velocity $\boldsymbol{u}^1$ and the domain deformation h^1 we express its time derivative in the last term in terms of h^1. To this end we have used the following equality

$$\bar{\partial}_t^{h^2}(h^2\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1) = \mathbb{J}^{-1}\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1) + \mathbb{E}_1, \tag{22}$$

where the additional error term $\mathbb{E}_1$ reads

$$\mathbb{E}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} [\frac{h_t^1}{h^1} - \frac{h_t^2}{h^2}]\partial_{y_2}(y_2 h^1 u_1^1) \\ [\frac{h_t^1}{h^1} - \frac{h_t^2}{h^2}]y_2 h^2 \left(\frac{\partial u_2^1}{\partial y_2} - y_2 E\frac{\partial u_1^1}{\partial y_2}\right) + y_2 u_1^1[\partial_t h^2 E - h^2\partial_t E] \end{bmatrix} \tag{23}$$

with $E := \frac{h_{y_1}^1 h^2 - h^1 h_{y_1}^2}{h^2} = h^2\partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})$. To derive (22), (23) tedious but straightforward manipulations have been performed.
Indeed, for the first component of $h^2\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_t^{h^2}(h^2\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1)_1 &= \partial_t(h^1u_1^1) - \frac{1}{h^2}h_t^2\partial_{y_2}(y_2h^1u_1^1) \\ &= \bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^1}(h^1u_1^1) + \partial_{y_2}(y_2h^1u_1^1)\left[\frac{h_t^1}{h^1} - \frac{h_t^2}{h^2}\right], \end{aligned}$$

compare the definition of the ALE-type time derivative in Section 2.1.
Since $(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1)_2 = u_2^1 - y_2Eu_1^1$, we can write for the second component

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_t^{h^2}(h^2\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1)_2 &= \bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^2}(h^2u_2^1) - \bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^2}(h^2y_2Eu_1^1) \\ &= \bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^2}(h^2u_2^1) - \partial_t(y_2h^2Eu_1^1) + \frac{1}{h^2}\frac{\partial h^2}{\partial t}\frac{\partial(y_2^2h^2Eu_1^1)}{\partial y_2} \\ &= \bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^2}(h^2u_2^1) - y_2E\bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^2}(h^2u_1^1) - y_2u_1^1(h^2\partial_tE - E\partial_th^2). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^2}(h^2u_i^1) = \frac{h^2}{h^1}\bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^1}(h^1u_i^1) + y_2h^2\partial_{y_2}u_i^1[\frac{h_t^1}{h^1} - \frac{h_t^2}{h^2}]$, $i = 1, 2$, and replacing $-y_2E$ by $y_2\frac{h^1}{h^2}h^1\partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^2}{h^1})$ in the second term on the right hand side of last equation we finally arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_t^{h^2}(h^2\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1)_2 &= \frac{h^2}{h^1}\bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^1}(h^1u_2^1) + y_2h^1\partial_{y_1}\left(\frac{h^2}{h^1}\right)\bar{\partial}_t^{\,h^1}(h^1u_1^1) \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{h_t^1}{h^1} - \frac{h_t^2}{h^2}\right]y_2h^2\left(\frac{\partial u_2^1}{\partial y_2} - y_2E\frac{\partial u_1^1}{\partial y_2}\right) + y_2u_1^1[\partial_th^2E - h^2\partial_tE]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (22), (23) hold true, see also the definition of the matrix $\mathbb{J}^{-1}$ above.

Finally, using (18) and (22), (23) we obtain for the difference of the time-derivative terms

$$\int_0^T \left\langle \bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^1 \right\rangle_X - \left\langle \bar{\partial}_t^{h^2}(h^2\boldsymbol{u}^2), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2 \right\rangle_X = \tag{24}$$
$$\frac{1}{2}\int_D |\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|^2(T)h^2(T) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \int_0^L \partial_t h^2 |\psi_2^2|^2 dy_1 dt$$
$$+ \int_0^T \left\langle ([\mathbb{R}^{-1}]^T - \mathbb{J}^{-1})\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2 \right\rangle_X - \int_D \mathbb{E}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dy\, dt.$$

Viscous terms:
The following lemma will be useful to handle the viscous terms.

Lemma 3.1. *For the transformed deformation tensor $\hat{e}_h$, cf. (15), it holds*

$$\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{v}) = \hat{e}_{h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{v}) - [\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{v}) + \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{v})^T], \tag{25}$$

where $$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{v}) = \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v})F_{h^1} + \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v})\mathbb{E}_3 + \nabla\boldsymbol{v}\mathbb{E}_3 \tag{26}$$

and $$\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v}) = \begin{bmatrix} v_1\frac{E}{h^2} + \frac{h^1-h^2}{h^2}\partial_{y_1}v_1 & \frac{h^1-h^2}{h^2}\partial_{y_2}v_1 \\ -y_2\partial_{y_1}(Ev_1) & -E\partial_{y_2}(y_2v_1) \end{bmatrix},\ E = h^2\partial_{y^1}(\tfrac{h^1}{h^2}), \tag{27}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_3 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ y_2\frac{E}{h^1} & [\frac{1}{h^1} - \frac{1}{h^2}] \end{bmatrix}, \quad F_{h^1} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{y_2}{h^1}\partial_{y_1}h^1 & \frac{1}{h^1} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{28}$$

Proof. Taking into account the definition (19) of the transformation matrix $\mathbb{R}$, one can easily obtain

$$\nabla(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{v}) = \nabla\boldsymbol{v} + \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})v_1 + \frac{h^1-h^2}{h^2}\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y_1} & \frac{h^1-h^2}{h^2}\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y_2} \\ -y_2\partial_{y_1}(h^2\partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2}))v_1 & -h^2\partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})\frac{\partial y_2 v_1}{\partial y_2} \end{bmatrix} = \nabla\boldsymbol{v} + \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v}). \tag{29}$$

Moreover, it is easy to show that

$$\hat{e}_h(\boldsymbol{v}) = \nabla\boldsymbol{v}F_h + (\nabla\boldsymbol{v}F_h)^T, \tag{30}$$

compare, e.g., [LHN16, Proof of Lemma 3.4]. Therefore we can write

$$\hat{e}_{h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{v}) = \nabla(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{v})F_{h^2} + (\nabla\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{v}F_{h^2})^T = (\nabla\boldsymbol{v} + \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v}))F_{h^2} + F_{h^2}^T(\nabla\boldsymbol{v}^T + \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v})^T).$$

One can verify that $F_{h^2} = F_{h^1} + \mathbb{E}_3$. Inserting this into above equality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{v}) \;=\; & \hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{v}) + \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v})F_{h^1} + F_{h^1}^T\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v})^T + \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v})\mathbb{E}_3 + \mathbb{E}_3^T\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{v})^T \\ & + \nabla\boldsymbol{v}\mathbb{E}_3 + \mathbb{E}_3^T\nabla\boldsymbol{v}^T, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (25). ∎

Now, we can rewrite the difference of the viscous terms from (21) $\int_0^T((\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^1))_{h^1} - ((\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2))_{h^2}dt$ using the Lemma (3.1) and (20),

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^1\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1):\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1) - h^2\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2):\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)dy\,dt \qquad (31)\\
&= \frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2\Big[\big(\hat{e}_{h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1) - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^1) - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^1)^T\big):\big(\hat{e}_{h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{\psi}^1) - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1) - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)^T\big)\\
&\qquad\qquad - \hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2):\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\Big] + (h^1-h^2)\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1):\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)dy\,dt\\
&= \frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2\Big[\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2):\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) - \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^1)+\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^1)^T):\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)}_{I_1}\\
&\qquad\qquad - \underbrace{\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1):(\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)+\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)^T)}_{I_2}\Big] + \underbrace{(h^1-h^2)\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1):\hat{e}_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)}_{I_3}dy\,dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

Convective terms:
In what follows we will need the following relation that can be easily shown using (19):

$$\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} + v_1\mathbb{E}_4, \quad \mathbb{E}_4 = \begin{bmatrix}\frac{h^1-h^2}{h^2}\\ -y_2E\end{bmatrix}, \qquad (32)$$

where we recall $E = h^2\partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})$. Note that (32) and (20) imply $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1 = \boldsymbol{\psi}^2 - \psi_1^1\mathbb{E}_4$, $\boldsymbol{u}^1 = \mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4$. Thus, using the trilinearity of the convective term we rewrite

$$
\begin{aligned}
&b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^1) - b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\\
&= b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) - b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\psi_1^1\mathbb{E}_4) - b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\\
&= b_{h^1}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) - b_{h^1}(u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) - b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\psi_1^1\mathbb{E}_4) - b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\\
&= b_{h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1-\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) + b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^1-\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) + b_{h^1-h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\\
&\quad -b_{h^1}(u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) - b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\psi_1^1\mathbb{E}_4)\\
&= b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) + b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2-u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) + b_{h^1-h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\\
&\quad -b_{h^1}(u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) - b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\psi_1^1\mathbb{E}_4),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the term $b_{h^1-h^2}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ is given by (16) with the difference (h^1-h^2) replacing h. Since by (17) $b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) = 0$, for the difference of the two

convective terms holds

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)-b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^2,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) \qquad (33)\\ &=\int_0^T b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)+b_{h^1-h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\\ &\quad -b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)-b_{h^1}(u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)-b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^1\mathbb{E}_4).\end{aligned}$$

Boundary terms:
Note that due to the boundary conditions on S_w we have $\psi_1^i(y_1,1,t)=0,\ u_1^i(y_1,1,t)=0,\ i=1,2$. Recalling (20), i.e., $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1=\mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^L(\partial_t h^1u_2^1\psi_2^1-\partial_t h^2u_2^2\psi_2^2)(y_1,1,t)dy_1dt \qquad (34)\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^L\partial_t h^2[u_2^1\psi_2^1-u_2^2\psi_2^2]+u_2^1\psi_2^1[\partial_t h^1-\partial_t h^2](y_1,1,t)dy_1dt\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^L\partial_t h^2\left[(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1-\boldsymbol{u}^2)_2\psi_2^2+\underbrace{((\mathbb{I}-\mathbb{R})\boldsymbol{u}^1)_2}_{=0}\psi_2^2+u_2^1\underbrace{((\mathbb{R}^{-1}-\mathbb{I})\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)_2}_{=0}\right]\\ &\quad+u_2^1\psi_2^1\partial_t[h^1-h^2]dy_1dt=\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^L\partial_t h^2|\psi_2^2|^2+u_2^1\psi_2^1\partial_t[h^1-h^2](y_1,1,t)dy_1dt.\end{aligned}$$

Let us mention that the first term on the right hand side of (34) vanishes in the sum with the boundary term arising on the right hand side of (24). Moreover, the pressure terms on S_w can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_0^L(q_w^1\psi_2^1-q_w^2\psi_2^2)(y_1,1,t)dy_1dt \qquad (35)\\ &\quad=\int_0^T\int_0^L(q_w^1-q_w^2)\psi_2^2(y_1,1,t)+q_w^1\underbrace{((\mathbb{R}^{-1}-\mathbb{I})\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)_2}_{=0}dy_1dt.\end{aligned}$$

For the boundary pressure terms on $S_{in/out}$ we use the equality $h^1\psi_1^1=h^2\psi_1^2$, following from the fact that $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1=\mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$, see (20). Thus,

$$\int_0^T\int_0^1(q_{in}^1h^1\psi_1^1-q_{in}^2h^2\psi_1^2)(0,y_2,t)dy_2dt=\int_0^T\int_0^1(q_{in}^1-q_{in}^2)h^2\psi_1^2(0,y_2,t)dy_2dt, \qquad (36)$$

analogously for the terms with q_{out}.

Finally, after replacing the differences of the time-derivative terms, viscous terms, convective and boundary terms in (21) according to (24), (31),

(33), (34)–(36), respectively, the resulting difference of two weak formulations reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int_D |\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|^2(T)h^2(T)dy + \frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2):\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)dydt \qquad (37)\\
&+\frac{1}{2E}\int_0^L |\xi|^2(T) + \frac{aE}{2}\left|\partial_{y_1}\bar{\eta}\right|^2(T) + \frac{bE}{2}|\bar{\eta}|^2(T) + \frac{c}{E}\int_0^T\int_0^L |\partial_{y_1}^2\xi|^2 dy_1 dt\\
&= \int_0^T -\left\langle([\mathbb{R}^{-1}]^T - \mathbb{J}^{-1})\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\right\rangle_X + \int_D \mathbb{E}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dy\, dt\\
&+\int_0^T\int_D \frac{\mu}{\rho}h^2(I_1+I_2) - I_3\, dy\, dt - \int_0^T b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) + b_{h^1-h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)\, dt\\
&+\int_0^T b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) + b_{h^1}(u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2) + b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\psi_1^1\mathbb{E}_4)\, dt\\
&\int_0^T\int_0^1 -(q_{in}^1 - q_{in}^2)h^2\psi_1^2(0,y_2,t) + (q_{out}^1 - q_{out}^2)h^2\psi_1^2(L,y_2,t)dy_2dt\\
&-\int_0^T\int_0^L (q_w^1 - q_w^2)\psi_2^2(y_1,1,t) + \frac{1}{2}u_2^1\psi_2^1\partial_t(h^1-h^2)(y_1,1,t)dy_1dt,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the error terms $\mathbb{E}_1$, I_1, I_2, I_3 and $\mathbb{E}_4$ are defined in (23), (26), (27), (28), (31) and (32), respectively.

In the second term on the left hand side of the above equality we apply Korn's first inequality with variable coefficients, see, e.g., [Nef02], [Pom03]. Indeed, using (30) we can write

$$
\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2|\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)|^2 dydt = \frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 F_{h^2} + (\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 F_{h^2})^T|,
$$

where $F_{h^2} = F_{h^2}(y) : \bar{\Omega}\to\mathbb{R}^{2\times 2}$ is a continuous mapping, $det(F_h^2) = \frac{1}{h^2} > \alpha > 0$, cf. (28). Consequently, Corollary 4.1 in [Pom03] implies an existence of a positive constant c_{Ko} such that

$$
\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_D h^2|\hat{e}_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)|^2 dy \geq c_{Ko}\frac{\mu}{\rho}\alpha\int_D |\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|^2 dy,\ \forall\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\in\boldsymbol{V}_{div}.
$$

In what follows we will estimate the terms on the right hand side of (37) in an appropriate way to apply the Gronwall lemma.

3.2 Estimate of the right hand side of (37)

In what follows we use the notation $\bar{h} = h^1 - h^2$. We also express the terms with $E = h^2\partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})$ by means of the differences $\bar{h}$,

$$
h^2E = h^2\partial_{y_1}h^1 - h^1\partial_{y_1}h^2 = h^1\partial_{y_1}\bar{h} - \partial_{y_1}h^1\bar{h}. \qquad (38)
$$

Before we start with giving the estimates, we introduce the following useful lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *For all $\boldsymbol{v} \in \boldsymbol{V}_{div}$, space $\boldsymbol{V}_{div}$ defined in (11), it holds*

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{0\le y_1\le L} \int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}|^2 dy_2 \le c\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(D)}.$$

Proof. We can write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}(y_1,y_2,t)|^2 dy_2 &= \int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}(0,y_2,t)|^2 dy_2 + \int_0^{y_1}\partial_\theta \int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}(\theta,y_2,t)|^2 dy_2\, d\theta \\ &= \int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}(0,y_2,t)|^2 dy_2 + 2\int_0^{y_1}\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}(\theta,y_2,t)|\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}}{\partial_\theta}(\theta,y_2,t) dy_2\, d\theta \\ &\le \|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2_{L^2(S_w)} + 2\int_D |\boldsymbol{v}||\nabla \boldsymbol{v}| dy.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Hölder inequality and using the trace argument in the first term on the right hand side of the last inequality, i.e. $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(\partial D)} \le c\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{v}\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(D)}$, cf., e.g., [LHN16, Lemma 3.2], we get from above

$$\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}(y_1,y_2,t)|^2 dy_2 \le c\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(D)},$$

which is valid for each $y_1 \in [0,L]$. Taking essential supremum of $\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{v}|^2 dy_2$ over all $0 \le y_1 \le L$ yields the statement of this lemma. □

From now on we use following abbreviations for norms of functions defined on $(0,L)$: $\|\cdot\|_\infty := \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(0,L)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{1,\infty} := \|\cdot\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,L)}$. Moreover, $C_{K,\alpha} := C(K,\alpha,\alpha^{-1})$ denotes a constant depending on the given constants K,α from (9).

Time derivative terms

We can estimate the time-derivative term on the right hand side of (37) by

$$\left\langle ([\mathbb{R}^{-1}]^T - \mathbb{J}^{-1})\bar\partial_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\right\rangle_X \le \|[\mathbb{R}^{-1}]^T - \mathbb{J}^{-1}\|_\infty \|\bar\partial_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|_{X^\star}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_X.$$

Since

$$[\mathbb{R}^{-1}]^T - \mathbb{J}^{-1} = \frac{1}{h^1}\begin{bmatrix} -\bar h & y_2(h^1\bar h_{y_1} -_{y_1} h^1_{y_1}\bar h) \\ y_2(h^1\bar h_{y_1} - h^1_{y_1}\bar h) & \bar h\end{bmatrix},$$

we have $\|[\mathbb{R}^{-1}]^T - \mathbb{J}^{-1}\|_\infty \le C_{K,\alpha}(\|\bar{h}\|_\infty + \|\bar{h}_{y_1}\|_\infty)$. Thus, using the Young inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \left\langle ([\mathbb{R}^{-1}]^T - \mathbb{J}^{-1})\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1), \boldsymbol{\psi}^2 \right\rangle_X \qquad (39)\\
&\le C_\varepsilon C_{K,\alpha}^2 \|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))} \int_0^T \|\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|^2_{X^\star \cap L^{\frac{4}{3}}(D)} + \varepsilon \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_X^2 dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon^{-1})$ and ε is a sufficiently small constant (to be determined later). Note that the test function $\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 = \mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2$ is bounded in $L^4(Q)$, $Q := (0,T)\times D$. This holds true due to the estimates
$\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^4(Q)} \le C_{K,\alpha}\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^4(Q)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{L^4(Q)}$ and
$\|\boldsymbol{u}^i\|^4_{L^4(Q)} \le c\|\boldsymbol{u}^i\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}\|\boldsymbol{u}^i\|^2_{L^2(Q)}$, $i = 1,2$, obtained using the Sobolev interpolations, see, e.g., [LHN16, Lemma 3.1]. Thus, according to point ii) in Section 2.1 $\|\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|_{L^2(0,T;X^\star)\oplus L^{4/3}((0,T)\times D)}$ is bounded.

Let us now we estimate the error term $\int_0^T\int_D \mathbb{E}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dydt$ on the right hand side of (37). We first rewrite the components of $\mathbb{E}_1$ given by (23) in terms of the differences of $\bar{h}$, $\bar{h}_t$, $\bar{h}_{t\,y_1}$, cf. also (38),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{h^1_t}{h^1} - \frac{h^2_t}{h^2} &= \frac{\bar{h}_t}{h^1} - \frac{h^2_t}{h^1h^2}\bar{h},\\
h^2\partial_t E &= -\bar{h}\left(h^1_{ty_1} + \frac{h^2_t}{h^2}h^1_{y_1}\right) + \bar{h}_{y_1}\left(h^1_t + \frac{h^2_t}{h^2}h^1\right) - \bar{h}_t h^1_{y_1} + \bar{h}_{ty_1}h^1.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the last term of $h^2\partial_t E$ has to be treated in a different way, we split the term $\mathbb{E}_1$ into $\mathbb{E}_1 = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1 - y_2 u_1^1 \bar{h}_{ty_1}h^1$ and estimate the term $\int_0^T\int_D \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dydt$ as first. We have

$$|\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1| \le C_{K,\alpha}\Big(\underbrace{|\boldsymbol{u}^1 + \nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1||\bar{h}_t|}_{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^a} + \underbrace{|\boldsymbol{u}^1 + \nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1|\big[|\bar{h}| + |\bar{h}_{y_1}|\big]\big[|h^1_t| + |h^1_{ty_1}| + |h^2_t|\big]}_{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^b}\Big).$$

The term containing $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^a$ is now estimated by Lemma 3.2 applied to $|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_D \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^a\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dydt \le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_0^L |\bar{h}_t|\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{u}^1 + \nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2| dy_2dy_1dt\\
&\le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \left(ess\sup_{0\le y_1\le L}\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\int_0^L |\bar{h}_t|\left(\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{u}^1 + \nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2 dy_2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dy_1dt\\
&\le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(D)}\|\bar{h}_t\|_{L^2(0,L)}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Employing $\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}$ and using the Young inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_D \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^a\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dydt\\ &\leq \varepsilon\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^2 dt + C_\varepsilon C_{K,\alpha}^2\|\bar{h}_t\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(0,L))}^2\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^2 dt.\end{aligned}$$

Using the Hölder and the Young inequalities it follows for the second term $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^b$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_D \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^b\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dydt\\ &\leq C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\big(\|h_t^1\|_{1,\infty}+\|h_t^2\|_\infty\big)dt\\ &\leq \frac{C_{K,\alpha}^2}{2}\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^2\omega_h(T) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^2\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}^2 dt,\end{aligned}$$

where $\int_0^T \|h_t^1\|_{1,\infty}^2 + \|h_t^2\|_\infty^2 dt =: \omega_h(T)$. [2] Hence we can summarize that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_D \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dydt \qquad (40)\\ &\leq \varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^2 dt + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^2\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}^2 dt\\ &+C_{K,\alpha}^2\Big(C_\varepsilon\|\bar{h}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(0,L))}^2\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^2 dt + \|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^2\omega_h(T)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

It remains to show the estimate of the remaining term of $\mathbb{E}_1$, i.e., the term $-\int_0^T\int_D y_2 u_1^1\bar{h}_{ty_1}h^1\psi_2^2 dydt$. By the partial integration with respect to y_1 and due to the zero boundary conditions for ψ_2^2 on $S_{in}\cup S_{out}$ we can rewrite this term as

$$-\int_0^T\int_D y_2 u_1^1\bar{h}_{ty_1}h^1\psi_2^2 dydt = \int_0^T\int_D y_2\bar{h}_t(h_{y_1}^1\psi_2^2u_1^1 + h^1\partial_{y_1}\psi_2^2u_1^1 + h^1\psi_2^2\partial_{y_1}u_1^1)dydt.$$

Thus, cf. (9),

$$-\int_0^T\int_D y_2 u_1^1\bar{h}_{ty_1}h^1\psi_2^2 dydt \leq C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_D |\bar{h}_t||\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2||\boldsymbol{u}^1| + |\bar{h}_t||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2||\boldsymbol{u}^1+\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1|dydt.$$

[2] Let us point out that $\omega_h(T)\downarrow 0$ as $T\downarrow 0$. This will be essential in Section 4 in order to show the contractivity.

Analogously as in term $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_1^a$ above, we apply now Lemma 3.2 to $|\boldsymbol{u}^1|$ in the first term and to $|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|$ in the second term on the right hand side. Consequently applying the Young inequality we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\int_0^T\int_D y_2 u_1^1 \bar{h}_{ty_1} h^1 \psi_2^2 dydt &\le 2C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\bar{h}_t\|_{L^2(D)}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt \quad (41)\\
&\le \varepsilon\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt + C_\varepsilon C^2_{K,\alpha}\|\bar{h}_t\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(0,L))}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking into account above estimates (40), (41), we can conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_D \mathbb{E}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}^2 dydt \quad (42)\\
&\le 2\varepsilon\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}dt\\
&+C^2_{K,\alpha}\Big(2C_\varepsilon\|\bar{h}\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(0,L))}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt + \|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}\omega_h(T)\Big),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\omega_h(T) := \int_0^T \|h_t^1\|^2_{1,\infty} + \|h_t^2\|^2_\infty dt$ and $C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon^{-1})$.

Viscous terms

Let us start with the estimation of term containing I_1, cf. (31). We have

$$
\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2 I_1 dydt \le \frac{\mu\alpha^{-1}}{\rho}\int_0^T \|\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|_{L^2(D)}\|F_{h^2}\|_\infty\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}dt.
$$

Note that by (9) $\|F_{h^i}\|_\infty \le C_{K,\alpha}$, $i = 1, 2$.
Secondly, we estimate $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^1) = \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{u}^1)(F_{h^1}+\mathbb{E}_3)+\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\mathbb{E}_3$, cf. (26). The term $\mathbb{E}_3$ given by (28) can be bounded in view of (38) by $\|\mathbb{E}_3\|_\infty \le C_{K,\alpha}\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}$. Hence,

$$
\|\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|_{L^2(D)} \le C_{K,\alpha}\big(\|\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|_{L^2(D)}(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}+1)+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\big). \quad (43)
$$

In the next step we concentrate on the estimate of $\|\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|_{L^2(D)}$. Using (38) one can easily verify that $\partial_{y_1}E = \frac{1}{h^2}\Big(h^1\bar{h}_{y_1y_1} - h^1_{y_1y_1}\bar{h} - \frac{h^2_{y_1}}{h^2}(h^1\bar{h}_{y_1} - h^1_{y_1}\bar{h})\Big)$. Therefore, for the matrix $\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{u}^1)$ (27) it holds

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{u}^1)| \;\le\; & C_{K,\alpha}\big[(|\bar{h}|+|\bar{h}_{y_1}|)(|\boldsymbol{u}^1|+|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1|) \quad (44)\\
&+(|\bar{h}||h^1_{y_1y_1}|+|\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}||h^1|)|\boldsymbol{u}^1|\big].
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us point out, that the second derivatives $\partial^2_{y_1}\bar{h}$, $\partial^2_{y_1}h^1$ only belong to $L^2(0,L)$. Therefore we estimate the corresponding terms in the expression for $\|\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|^2_{L^2(D)}$ employing Lemma 3.2 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\int_D |\bar{h}|^2|h^1_{y_1y_1}|^2|\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2 &\leq \|\bar{h}\|^2_\infty \int_0^L |h^1_{y_1y_1}|^2 dy_1 \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{0\leq y_1\leq L}\int_0^1 |\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2 dy_2,\\ &\leq c_1\|\bar{h}\|^2_\infty \|h^1\|^2_{H^2(0,L)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Analogously,

$$\int_D |\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|^2|h^1|^2|\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2 \leq c_2\alpha^{-1}\|\bar{h}\|^2_{H^2(0,L)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(D)}.$$

Consequently, taking into account (44) and above estimates we obtain

$$\|\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C_{K,\alpha}\big[\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty} + \|\bar{h}\|_\infty\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)} + \|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)}\big]\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}. \quad (45)$$

Finally, using (43),(45), Young's inequality and the fact that $\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\leq K$, cf. (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2 I_1 dydt &\leq \frac{C_{K,\alpha}\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\big[\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}) \qquad (46)\\ &\qquad +\|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)}\big]\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}dt\\ &\leq \varepsilon\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}dt + C_\varepsilon C^2_{K,\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(D))}\\ &\qquad \cdot\Big(\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}C_h^2 + \|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where $C_\varepsilon = C\big(\varepsilon^{-1},\frac{\mu}{\rho}\big)$ and

$$C_h := 1 + \|h^1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))} + \|h^2\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))} \quad (47)$$

is bounded.

Now we proceed with the estimate of term containing I_2, cf. (31),

$$\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2 I_2 dydt \leq \frac{\mu\alpha^{-1}}{\rho}\int_0^T\|F_{h^1}\|_\infty\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)\|_{L^2(D)}dt.$$

We recall $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1) = \mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)(F_{h^1}+\mathbb{E}_3) + \nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\mathbb{E}_3$. Analogously as in (43) we can bound

$$\|\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C_{K,\alpha}\big(\|\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)\|_{L^2(D)}(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}+1)+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\big). \quad (48)$$

Repeating similar estimates as in (44), (45) we obtain

$$\|\mathbb{E}_2(\boldsymbol{\psi}^1)\|_{L^2(D)} \le C_{K,\alpha}\big[\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)})+\|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)}\big]\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)}. \quad (49)$$

Consequently, using (48), (49) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2 I_2 dydt \;&\le\; \frac{C_{K,\alpha}\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\big[\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}) \quad (50)\\ &\quad +\|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)}\big]\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)}dt.\end{aligned}$$

In order to replace the norm of $\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1$ by norm of $\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$ we now use the relation $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1=\mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$ cf. (20) . One can verify that

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla(\mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)| \;&\le\; C_{K,\alpha}|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|+\big|\partial_{y_1}(\tfrac{h^2}{h^1})(1-y_2h^1_{y_1}-h^1)-y_2h^1\partial^2_{y_1}(\tfrac{h^2}{h^1})\big||\psi^2_1|\\ &\le\; C_{K,\alpha}\Big(|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|+|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|(1+|\partial^2_{y_1}h^1|+|\partial^2_{y_1}h^2|)\Big),\quad \text{thus}\end{aligned}$$

$$\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)} \le C_{K,\alpha}\Big(\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}+\|h^2\|_{H^2(0,L)})\Big). \quad (51)$$

Replacing (51) into (50) we finally obtain analogous estimate to (46), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2 I_2 dydt \;&\le\; \varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt+\bar{C}_\varepsilon C^2_{K,\alpha}C^2_h\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(D))} \quad (52)\\ &\quad .\Big(\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}C^2_h+\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

with $\bar{C}_\varepsilon=\bar{C}\big(\varepsilon^{-1},\frac{\mu}{\rho}\big)$.

It remains to show the estimate of term containing I_3, cf. (31). Note, that

$$\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D I_3 dydt \le \frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\|\bar{h}\|_\infty\|F_{h^1}\|^2_\infty\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)}dt.$$

Using (51), (47), and by applying Young's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D I_3 dydt \le \frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T C^3_{K,\alpha}C_h\|\bar{h}\|_\infty\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt \quad (53)\\ &\le \varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt+\tilde{C}_\varepsilon C^6_{K,\alpha}C^2_h\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(D))}\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty((0,T)\times(0,L))},\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C}_\varepsilon=\bar{C}\big(\varepsilon^{-1},\frac{\mu}{\rho}\big)$.

Summarizing the above estimates of viscous error terms (46), (52), (53) we finally get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mu}{\rho}\int_0^T\int_D h^2 I_1 + h^2 I_2 - I_3 dy dt \qquad (54)\\
&\leq 3\varepsilon\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} dt + C_\varepsilon(C_{K,\alpha}^2 + C_{K,\alpha}^6)C_h^2\\
&\qquad .\Big(\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))} + \|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}\Big)\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(D))},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_\varepsilon = C\big(\varepsilon^{-1}, \frac{\mu}{\rho}\big)$ and C_h is given by (47).

Convective terms

In this part we estimate the terms arising in the difference of convective terms for $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$, see (33).

I) Recalling (17) and (9) for the first term on the right hand side of (33) it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T |b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)| dt &\leq \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T |B_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)| + |B_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \boldsymbol{u}^1)| dt\\
&\leq C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_0^D |\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|^2|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1| + |\boldsymbol{\psi}^2||\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2||\boldsymbol{u}^1| dy\, dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Further, applying the Hölder inequality, the Sobolev interpolation inequality in two dimensions: $\|\varphi\|_{L^4(D)} \leq c\|\nabla\varphi\|^{1/2}_{L^2(D)}\|\varphi\|^{1/2}_{L^2(D)}$, compare, e.g., [LHN16, Lemma 3.1], and Young's inequality

$$ab \leq \varepsilon a^p + C_\varepsilon b^{\frac{p}{p-1}}, \quad C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon^{-1}),\ 1 < p < \infty \qquad (55)$$

for $p = 2, 4$ we finally get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T |b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^2, \boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)| dt \ &\leq\ C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2} \qquad (56)\\
&\qquad + \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^{1/2}_{L^2}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^{3/2}_{L^2}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^{1/2}_{L^2}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^{1/2}_{L^2} dt\\
&\leq 2\varepsilon\int_0^T \|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2_{L^2} dt + C_\varepsilon^{I\cdot} C_{K,\alpha}^2\int_0^T \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the abbreviation $\|\cdot\|_{L^2} := \|\cdot\|_{L^2(D)}$. Note that $C_\varepsilon^{I\cdot}$ is a constant dependent on ε^{-1} and on the norm $\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$.

II) By the assistance of (17), (9) and using $|\mathbb{R}| \leq C_{K,\alpha}$, cf. (19), we can write for the second term on the right hand side of (33)

$$\int_0^T |b_{h^1-h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)|dt \leq C_{K,\alpha} \int_0^T \|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty} \int_D |\boldsymbol{u}^1||\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2| + |\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}^2| dy dt. \quad (57)$$

Now, using the Hölder and the Sobolev inequalities mentioned above we obtain

$$\int_0^T |b_{h^1-h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)|dt \leq \quad (58)$$
$$C_{K,\alpha} \int_0^T \|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty} \Big(\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2} \Big) dt$$

Further, with use of Young's inequality

$$ab \leq \frac{1}{p} a^p + \frac{p-1}{p} b^{\frac{p}{p-1}}, \ 1 < p < \infty \quad (59)$$

with $p = 4$ the first term on the right hand side of (58) can be bounded from above by

$$\frac{1}{4} \int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 dt$$
$$+ \quad \frac{3}{4} C_{K,\alpha}^{4/3} \|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty 0,T;(W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^{4/3} \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^\infty 0,T;(L^2(D))}^{2/3} \int_0^T \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^{2/3} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^{4/3} dt.$$

Consequently, by applying Young's inequality (55) with $p = 3$ we get for this term

$$\frac{1}{4} \int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 dt + \varepsilon \int_0^T \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2 dt$$
$$+ \quad \frac{3}{4} C_\varepsilon C_{K,\alpha}^2 \|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty 0,T;(W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^\infty 0,T;(L^2(D))} \int_0^T \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 dt.$$

The second right hand side term in (58) can be bounded by Young's inequality (55) with $p = 2$ as well by

$$\varepsilon \int_0^T \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2 dt + C_\varepsilon C_{K,\alpha}^2 \|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}^2 \int_0^T \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 dt.$$

We finally come to

$$\int_0^T |b_{h^1-h^2}(\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)|dt \leq \frac{1}{4} \int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 dt + 2\varepsilon \int_0^T \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2 dt \quad (60)$$
$$+ C_\varepsilon^{II} \cdot C_{K,\alpha}^2 \|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;(W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^2 \int_0^T \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2 dt,$$

where $C_\varepsilon^{II\cdot}$ is a constant depending on ε^{-1} and on the norm $\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$.

III) We proceed with the estimate of the third term on the right hand side of (33). Let us remark that with the assistance of (32) and (38) one can easily show that $|\mathbb{E}_4| \le C_{K,\alpha}(|\bar{h}| + |\bar{h}_{y_1}|)$. Moreover, $|\nabla \mathbb{E}_4| \le C_{K,\alpha}(|\bar{h}|(1 + |h^1_{y_1y_1}|) + |\bar{h}_{y_1}| + |\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|)$, see, e.g., lines above (44). Thus

$$\int_0^T b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2, u_1^1\mathbb{E}_4, \boldsymbol{\psi}^2)dt \le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\int_D |\boldsymbol{u}^2||\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2| + |\boldsymbol{u}^2||\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2||\boldsymbol{u}^1| \quad (61)$$
$$+C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_D |\boldsymbol{u}^2||\boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1 + |h^1_{y_1y_1}|) + |\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|).$$

Let us mention that the first two terms on the right hand side are similar to the right hand side of (57) and can be bounded from above by applying analogous estimates as before, using Young's inequalities (59) with $p = 2$, 4 and (55) with $p = 3$, by

$$\frac{1}{4}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{L^2}dt + 2\varepsilon\int_0^T \|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2}dt \quad (62)$$
$$+\dot{C}_\varepsilon^{III\cdot}C^2_{K,\alpha}\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;(W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}\big(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(Q)} + \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(Q)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{L^2(Q)}\big),$$

where $Q := (0,T)\times D$ and $\dot{C}_\varepsilon^{III\cdot}$ is a constant dependent on ε^{-1} and on the norms of $\boldsymbol{u}^1$, $\boldsymbol{u}^2$ in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))$, compare (60).

In the last term on the right hand side of (61) we firstly apply the Hölder inequality with respect to integral $\int_0^1 dy_2$,

$$C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_D |\boldsymbol{u}^2||\boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1 + |h^1_{y_1y_1}|) + |\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|)dydt$$
$$\le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_0^L \big(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1 + |h^1_{y_1y_1}|) + |\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|\big)\|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{L^2(0,1)}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^4(0,1)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^4(0,1)}dy_1dt.$$

Then we apply Lemma 3.2 to $\|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{L^2(0,1)}$ and the Hölder inequality with respect to the integral $\int_0^L dy_1$ to arrive at

$$\le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2}\|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^4}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^4}\big(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1 + \|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}) + \|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)}\big),$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{L^r} := \|\cdot\|_{L^r(D)}$, $r = 2, 4$. Finally, using the Sobolev interpolations as in the first point I), Young's inequalities (59) with $p = 4$ and (55) with

$p = 3$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_D |\boldsymbol{u}^2||\boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1+|h^1_{y_1y_1}|)+|\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|) \qquad (63)\\
&\le C_{K,\alpha}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^{1/2}_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}\|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^{1/2}_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}\cdot\\
&\quad\big(\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}(1+\|h^1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))})+\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}\big)\cdot\\
&\quad\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^{1/2}_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^{1/2}_{L^2(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^{1/2}_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^{1/2}_{L^2(D)}dt\\
&\le\frac{1}{4}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}dt+\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}dt+\\
&\quad\bar{C}^{III\cdot}_{\varepsilon}C^2_{K,\alpha}\big(C^2_h\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}+\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}\big)\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}dt,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\bar{C}^{III\cdot}_{\varepsilon}$ is a constant dependent on ε^{-1} and on the norms of $\boldsymbol{u}^1$, $\boldsymbol{u}^2$ in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))$. We recall $1+\|h^1\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}\le C_h$.

Finally, taking into account (62) and (63) we get from (61) that the third term on the right hand side of (33) can be estimated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T|b_{h^2}(\boldsymbol{u}^2,u^1_1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)|dt&\le\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2}dt+3\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2}dt \qquad (64)\\
&+C^{III\cdot}_{\varepsilon}C^2_{K,\alpha}\big[(C^2_h+1)\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}+\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}\big]\cdot\\
&\big(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(Q)}+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(Q)}+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{L^2(Q)}\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $C^{III\cdot}_{\varepsilon}$ is a constant dependent on ε^{-1}, on the norms of $\boldsymbol{u}^i$ in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))$, $i=1,2$, and C_h is given by (47).

IV) To the estimate the fourth term on the right hand side of (33) we recall $|\mathbb{E}_4|\le C_{K,\alpha}(|\bar{h}|+|\bar{h}_{y_1}|)$, which follows from (32) and (38). Using (17) we get

$$
\int_0^T b_{h^1}(u^1_1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)dt\le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\int_D|\boldsymbol{u}^1||\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|+|\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2|dydt.
$$

Since the right hand side of the last inequality is the same as in (57), we refer here to estimates (57)–(60) to arrive to the final estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T b_{h^1}(u^1_1\mathbb{E}_4,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^2)dt&\le\frac{1}{4}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2}dt+2\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2}dt \qquad (65)\\
&+C^{IV\cdot}_{\varepsilon}C^2_{K,\alpha}\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;(W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2}dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

The constant $C_\varepsilon^{IV.}$ dependends on ε^{-1} and on the norm $\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$.

V) In the estimate of the fifth term on the right hand side of (33) we again use that $|\mathbb{E}_4| \le C_{K,\alpha}(|\bar{h}| + |\bar{h}_{y_1}|)$ and $|\nabla\mathbb{E}_4| \le C_{K,\alpha}(|\bar{h}|(1+|h^1_{y_1y_1}|) + |\bar{h}_{y_1}| + |\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|)$, see the point III) above. Thus,

$$\int_0^T b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}^1_1\mathbb{E}_4)dt \le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\int_D |\boldsymbol{u}^1||\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1||\boldsymbol{\psi}^1| + |\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1| \quad (66)$$
$$+C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_D |\boldsymbol{u}^1|^2|\boldsymbol{\psi}^1|(\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1+|h^1_{y_1y_1}|) + |\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|)dydt.$$

To bound the right hand side of the last inequality by means of $\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$ we recall $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1 = \mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$, cf. (20), and use (51). After applying the Hölder and the Sobolev inequalities, the first two terms on the right hand side of (66) can be bounded by

$$C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}\Big[\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^{\frac12}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^{\frac32}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}}^{\frac12}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}+\|h^2\|_{H^2(0,L)})^{\frac12}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^{\frac12}$$
$$+\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}+\|h^2\|_{H^2(0,L)})\Big].$$

Now, using the Young inequalities as in the point II), see (57)–(60), we come to the following bound for the first two terms on the right hand side of (66),

$$\frac14\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2dt + 2\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}}^2dt \quad (67)$$
$$+\dot{C}_\varepsilon^{V.}(C_{h,u}+C_{h,u}^2)C_{K,\alpha}^2\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2dt,$$

where, cf. (47),

$$C_{h,u} := C_h\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))} \quad (68)$$

is bounded, and $\dot{C}_\varepsilon^{V.}$ depends on ε^{-1}.

The last term on the right hand side of (66) can be estimated with the use of the Hölder inequality with respect to $\int_0^1 dy_2$, Lemma 3.2 applied for $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1$ and the Sobolev interpolations as follows

$$C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\int_0^L \big[\|\bar{h}\|_{1,\infty}(1+|h^1_{y_1y_1}|)+|\bar{h}_{y_1y_1}|\big]\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^4(0,1)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(0,1)}dy_1dt$$
$$\le C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)}^{\frac12}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)}^{\frac12}\cdot$$
$$\big[\|\bar{h}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,L)}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)})+\|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)}\big]\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}dt.$$

Further, applying $\boldsymbol{\psi}^1 = \mathbb{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}^2$, cf. (20), and using (51) we get

$$\leq C_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}+\|h^2\|_{H^2(0,L)})\cdot$$
$$\big[\|\bar{h}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,L)}(1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)})+\|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)}\big]\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}dt.$$

Finally, we apply Young's inequalities (59) with $p=4$ and (55) with $p=3$ to obtain the estimate for the last term on the right side of (66), i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{4}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2dt+\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}}^2dt \tag{69}$$
$$\bar{C}_\varepsilon^{V\cdot}C_{K,\alpha}^2C_{h,u}^2(C_h^2\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^2+\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}^2)\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}dt,$$

where $\bar{C}_\varepsilon^{V\cdot}$ depends on ε^{-1}.

Summarizing the estimates (67), (69) we finally obtain

$$\int_0^T|b_{h^1}(\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{u}^1,\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^1\mathbb{E}_4)|dt\leq\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2}^2dt+3\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}}^2dt \tag{70}$$
$$+C_\varepsilon^{V\cdot}C_{K,\alpha}^2C_{h,u}^2\big[(C_h+1+C_{h,u}^{-1})\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))}^2+\|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}^2\big]$$
$$.(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(Q)}^2+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(Q)}).$$

Here $C_\varepsilon^{V\cdot}$ is a constant depending on ε^{-1} and $C_h, C_{h,u}$ depend on the norms $\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^2(D))}$, $\|h^1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}$ and $\|h^2\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}$, cf. (47), (68).

Boundary terms

It remains to estimate the boundary terms in (37), cf. (34), (35), (36). This can be done with the use of the following trace argument for $\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{V}$:

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^r(\partial D)}\leq c\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(D)}^{\frac{1}{r}}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(D)}^{1-\frac{1}{r}},\ 0<r<\infty,$$

cf. [LHN16, Lemma 3.2]. As first we demonstrate the estimate of the pressure term containing q_{in}. The pressure terms on the outflow S_{out} and the bottom boundary S_w can be bounded analogously. We denote $q_{in}^1-q_{in}^2:=\bar{q}_{in}$. It holds that

$$\int_0^T\int_0^1|q_{in}^1-q_{in}^2||h^2\psi_1^2(0,y_2,t)|\leq\int_0^T\alpha^{-1}\|\bar{q}_{in}\|_{L^2(S_{in})}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt$$
$$\leq\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}^2dt+C_\varepsilon\alpha^{-2}\int_0^T\|\bar{q}_{in}\|_{L^2(S_{in})}^2dt.$$

The boundary term with the difference of the time derivatives h_t^1, h_t^2 can be estimated as follows. By the Hölder inequality we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^L |u_2^1\psi_2^1|(y_1,1,t)|h_t^1 - h_t^2|dy_1dt \le \frac{c}{2}\int_0^T \|\bar{h}_t\|_{L^2(0,L)}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^4(S_w)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^4(S_w)}dt.$$

Using the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^4(S_w)} \le c\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\psi}^1\|_{L^2(D)}$, see the trace argumentmentioned above, and by (51) we get moreover

$$\le \frac{cC_{K,\alpha}}{2}\int_0^T \|\bar{h}_t\|_{L^2(0,L)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}[1+\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)}+\|h^2\|_{H^2(0,L)}]dt.$$

Then, applying the Young inequality (55) with $p=2$ we obtain

$$\le \varepsilon\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt + C_\varepsilon C^2_{K,\alpha}C_h^2\|\bar{h}_t\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(0,L))}\int_0^T\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(D)}dt,$$

where C_h is given by (47).

Thus, collecting all estimates of the boundary terms we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1 -(q_{in}^1-q_{in}^2)h^2\psi_1^2(0,y_2,t)+(q_{out}^1-q_{out}^2)h^2\psi_1^2(L,y_2,t)dy_2dt \qquad (71)\\
&-\int_0^T\int_0^L (q_w^1-q_w^2)\psi_2^2(y_1,1,t)+\frac{1}{2}u_2^1\psi_2^1\partial_t(h^1-h^2)(y_1,1,t)dy_1dt,\\
&\le 4\varepsilon\int_0^T\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}dt+\tilde{C}_\varepsilon C^2_{K,\alpha}\int_0^T\|\bar{q}_{in}\|^2_{L^2(S_{in})}+\|\bar{q}_{out}\|^2_{L^2(S_{out})}+\|\bar{q}_w\|^2_{L^2(S_w)}dt\\
&+\tilde{C}_\varepsilon C^2_{K,\alpha}C_h^2\|\bar{h}\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(0,L))}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{L^2(Q)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C}_\varepsilon$ depends on ε^{-1} and C_h is given by (47).

3.3 Final estimate

Let us summarize the above estimates of the right hand side of (37). Note that the constants $C_\varepsilon^{I.-IV.}$ and C_h, $C_{h,u}$ in the estimates (39), (42), (54), (56), (60), (64), (65), (70), (71) depend on the positive powers of the norms $\|\boldsymbol{u}^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$, $\|h^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}$, $i=1,2$, cf. (47) (68).

Applying the Korn inequality we finally get from (37):

$$g(T) + \frac{\alpha\mu}{\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \frac{c}{E}\|\partial^2_{y_1}\xi\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}dt \tag{72}$$
$$\leq 22\varepsilon\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + C_1\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}dt + \vartheta(T), \quad \text{where}$$
$$g(t) := \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}(t) + \frac{1}{2E}\|\xi\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t) + \frac{bE}{2}\|\bar{\eta}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t) + \frac{aE}{2}\|\partial_{y_1}\bar{\eta}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t),$$
$$\vartheta(t) := C_2\int_0^t \|\bar{q}_{in}\|^2_{L^2(S_{in})} + \|\bar{q}_{out}\|^2_{L^2(S_{out})} + \|\bar{q}_w\|^2_{L^2(S_w)}ds$$
$$+ C_3\omega(t)\left[\|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,t;W^{1,\infty}(0,L))} + \|\bar{h}\|^2_{L^\infty(0,t;H^2(0,L))} + \|\bar{h}\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,T;L^2(0,L))}\right],$$
$$\omega(t) := \int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\bar{\partial}^{h^1}_t(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|^2_{X^*}ds + \omega_h(t),$$

$\omega_h(t)$ is defined in (42), $\omega(t)\downarrow 0$ as $t\downarrow 0$, and
$C_1 = 2 + C^{I.}_\varepsilon(C^2_{K,\alpha} + C^4_{K,\alpha})$, $C_2 = C_\varepsilon C^2_{K,\alpha}$,
$C_3 = C^\varepsilon_{K,\alpha}[1 + C^2_h + C^{II.}_\varepsilon + (C^2_h+1)C^{III.}_\varepsilon + C^{IV.}_\varepsilon + C^{V.}_\varepsilon(C_{h,u} + C^2_{h,u} + C^2_{h,u}C_h)]$,
here $C^\varepsilon_{K,\alpha}$ denotes a constant depending on C_ε and $C_{K,\alpha}$.

Now, we chose an ε small enough such that $\frac{\alpha\mu}{\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko} - 22\varepsilon \geq \frac{\alpha\mu}{2\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko}$, i.e. $\varepsilon \leq \frac{\alpha\mu}{44\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko}$. Thus, the constants of type C_ε (and consequently the constants C_1, C_1, C_3) depend on $(\frac{\alpha\mu}{\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko})^{-1}$. By this choice of ε (72) yields

$$g(T) + \frac{\alpha\mu}{2\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko}\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \frac{c}{E}\|\partial^2_{y_1}\xi\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}dt \tag{73}$$
$$\leq C_1\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}dt + \vartheta(T).$$

Moreover, (72), (73) are also valid for all fixed t, $0\leq t\leq T$. Therefore after replacing T by t and omitting positive terms in (73) we obtain

$$g(t) \leq \vartheta(t) + C_4\int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}(s)g(s)ds, \quad C_4 = 2C_1\alpha^{-1}.$$

Since $\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}(s) \geq 0$ is an integrable function and $\vartheta \geq 0$ is a continuous non-decreasing function, the Gronwall lemma yields, see, e.g., [Fei93, Lemma 8.2.29],

$$g(t) \leq \vartheta(t) + C_4\int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}(s)\vartheta(s)e^{C_4\int_s^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}(\tau)d\tau}\,ds, \tag{74}$$
$$\leq \vartheta(t)\left(1 + C_4e^{C_4\int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}(s)ds}\int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}(s)ds\right) \leq C_5\vartheta(t).$$

Here C_5 depends on α^{-1}, K, $(\mu/\rho)^{-1}\tilde{c}_{Ko}^{-1}$ and on the norms $\|\boldsymbol{u}^i\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2(D))}$, $\|h^i\|_{L^\infty(0,t;L^2(0,L))}, i = 1, 2$, specified above, see also constants C_1, C_4.

Since $\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}(t) \leq 2\alpha^{-1}g(t)$, and $g(t) \leq C_5\vartheta(t)$, see (74), the right hand side of (73) can be bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C_1\int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}ds + \vartheta(t) \leq \\
&C_1 2\alpha^{-1}C_5\int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}\vartheta(s)ds + \vartheta(t) \leq \\
&\vartheta(t)(1 + C_1 2\alpha^{-1}C_5)\int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}(s)ds \leq C_6\vartheta(t),
\end{aligned}
$$

and we finally get, cf. (73),

$$
g(t) + \int_0^t \frac{\alpha\mu}{2\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \frac{c}{E}\|\partial^2_{y_1}\xi\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}dt \leq C_6\vartheta(t), \quad (75)
$$

where the constant C_6 depends on α^{-1}, K, $(\frac{\alpha\mu}{2\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko})^{-1}$ and on the norms of the weak solution $\boldsymbol{u}^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$ and the data $\|h^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}, i = 1, 2$. Here $g(t)$, $\vartheta(t)$ are defined in (72). Thus, taking into account the notations from (20) and $\xi := E(\eta^1_t - \eta^2_t)$, $\bar{\eta} := \eta^1 - \eta^1$, we proved the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 (Continuous dependence on data)**.**
Let $(\boldsymbol{u}^1, \eta^1)$, $(\boldsymbol{u}^2, \eta^2)$ be two weak solutions of the initial boundary value problem (1)–(8) transformed to the rectangular fixed domain D satisfying (13). Let the corresponding domain deformation be given by some functions h^1, h^2 satisfying (9). Let the transformed boundary pressures $q^1_{in/out/w}$ and $q^2_{in/out/w}$ belong to $L^2(0,T;L^2(S_{in/out/s}))$, respectively. Then for almost all $t \in (0,T)$ it holds:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{L^2(D)}(t) + \frac{\alpha\mu}{2\rho}\tilde{c}_{Ko}\int_0^t \|\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)}ds \quad (76)\\
&+\frac{E}{2}\|\eta^1_t - \eta^2_t\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t) + \frac{bE}{2}\|\eta^1 - \eta^2\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t) + \frac{aE}{2}\|\eta^1_{y_1} - \eta^2_{y_1}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)}(t)\\
&\quad +cE\int_0^t \|\eta^1_t - \eta^2_t\|^2_{H^2(0,L)}ds\\
&\leq C_7\left(\int_0^t \|q^1_{in} - q^2_{in}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)} + \|q^1_{out} - q^2_{out}\|^2_{L^2(0,L)} + \|q^1_w - q^2_w\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}ds\right.\\
&\qquad \left.+\omega(t)\left[\|h^1 - h^2\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,t;L^2(0,L))} + \|h^1 - h^2\|^2_{L^\infty(0,t;H^2(0,L))}\right]\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$\omega(t) = \int_0^t \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^2\|^2_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|\bar{\partial}_t^{h^1}(h^1\boldsymbol{u}^1)\|^2_{X^*} + \|h_t^1\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,L)} + \|h_t^2\|^2_{L^\infty(D)} ds \quad \textit{and} \quad \omega(t) \downarrow 0 \quad \textit{for} \quad t \downarrow 0.$$

Here $\tilde{c}_{Ko}$ is the coercivity constant of the viscous form coming from the Korn inequality, α, K are given by (9), μ, ρ, E, a, b, c are given by the physical model and $C_7 \equiv (C_2 + C_3)C_6$ (see the proof above) is a constant dependent on α^{-1}, K, $\tilde{c}_{Ko}^{-1}$ and on the norms $\|h^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(0,L))}$, $\|\boldsymbol{u}^i\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$, $i = 1, 2$.

Let us note that the presence of matrix $\mathbb{R} = J\mathbb{J}^{-1}$, cf. (19), in the above estimate has a technical reason and lies in the fact that the domain of definition for solutions $\boldsymbol{v}^1$ and $\boldsymbol{v}^2$ differs due to the coupling with the domain deformation. We recall that $\int_{\Omega(h^1)} v^1(X,t)dX = \int_{\Omega(h^2)} v^1(\Phi(x),t)Jdx = \int_{\Omega(h^2)} \tilde{v}^1(x,t)Jdx$, where $\Phi : \Omega(h^2) \to \Omega(h^1)$ and $J = det\,\mathbb{J}$, $\mathbb{J} = \frac{dX}{dx}$.

Remark 3.1.
Since $\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2 = \mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2 + (\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})\boldsymbol{u}^1$, we can write

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} \le \|\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} + \|(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)} + \|\partial_{y_1}(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)} + \|(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})\nabla\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{L^2(D)}.$$

Note, that the components of the matrix $\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R}$ cf. (19) are: $(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})_{11} = \frac{-\bar{h}}{h^2}$, $(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})_{21} = -y_2 h^2 \partial_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})$, $(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})_{12} = (\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{R})_{22} = 0$. Thus, with the assistance of (9), (38) and Lemma 3.2 we finally get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} \;\le\; & \|\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} + C_{K,\alpha}\|\bar{h}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,L)}\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)} \\ & + C_{K,\alpha}(\|\bar{h}\|_{H^2(0,L)} + \|\bar{h}\|_{L^\infty(0,L)}\|h^1\|_{H^2(0,L)})\|\boldsymbol{u}^1\|_{W^{1,2}(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence for $h^1 \to h^2$ and $g^1_{in/out/w} \to g^2_{in/out/w}$ a.e. the above estimate and (76) imply that $\|\boldsymbol{u}^1 - \boldsymbol{u}^2\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(D))\cap L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))} \to 0$. It means that the weak solution is continuously dependent on the domain deformation and the boundary pressure. ◇

Corollary 3.1 (Uniqueness of the weak solution)**.**
If the boundary conditions for pressure as well as the boundary deformation coincide for both solutions, i.e., $q^1_{in} = q^2_{in}$, $q^1_{out} = q^2_{out}$, $q^1_w = q^2_w$, $h^1 = h^2 := h$, then there exists a unique weak solution to the problem (1)–(8) on $\Omega(h)$, i.e., to the problem linearized with respect to the geometry in the sense of (9)–(18).

Proof. The result is a consequence of Theorem 3.1. Note that since $h^1 = h^2$ we have $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{I}$ in (76). □

4 Fixed point procedure with respect to the geometry

Previous result on uniqueness of the weak solution $(\boldsymbol{u}, \eta)$ defined on $\Omega(h)$ given by some sufficiently smooth functions δ, R_0, $h := R_0 + \delta$ satisfying (9) allows us to consider the following fixed point procedure with respect to the geometry of the computational domain. We consider a mapping $\mathcal{F}$, that is well defined through the weak formulation on $\Omega(h)$ (or its transformed form (13)). It maps the given function δ to the unique weak solution η, i.e., $\mathcal{F}(\delta) = \eta$. Once there exists a fixed point of this mapping, the original fluid-structure interaction problem (1)–(8) is solved. Let us point out that the Schauder fixed point argument yields the existence (but not uniqueness) of the weak solution to similar problems, see [CDEG05, Gra08, LR14, LHN16, HLN16]. Later on uniqueness for such problems for the Newtonian fluid has been shown in [GGP12] by deriving an additional estimate on the continuous dependence on initial data.

Here we apply the Banach fixed point theorem and obtain unique fixed point $\eta^\star = \mathcal{F}(\eta^\star)$. Using this fixed point argument we moreover prove the convergence of the iterative process $\eta^k = \mathcal{F}(\eta^{k-1})$. Hence we obtain the convergence of the global iterative method with respect to the domain geometry. Additionally, Theorem 3.1 implies uniqueness of the weak solution $(\boldsymbol{u}, \eta)$ obtained by this iterative procedure.

We consider following iterative process with respect to η;
Let $\delta = \eta^{k-1}, k = 1, 2, \dots,$ with given η^0, e.g., $\eta^0 = 0$. Let $(\boldsymbol{u}^k, \eta^k)$ be the weak solution obtained on $\Omega(h) = \Omega(R_0 + \eta^{k-1})$, i.e., $(\boldsymbol{u}^k, \eta^k)$ satisfy (13) for $h = R_0 + \eta^{k-1}$.

We define the space $\mathcal{Z} := H^1(0, T; H_0^2(0, L)) \cap W^{1,\infty}(0, T; L^2(D))$ and the mapping

$$\mathcal{F} : B_\alpha \subset \mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{Z}, \quad \mathcal{F}(\eta^{k-1}) = \eta^k. \tag{77}$$

Here B_α is a ball in space $\mathcal{Z}$ chosen such that the necessary properties of the domain deformation from (9) avoiding the contact of the deforming wall with the fixed bottom boundary are guarantied [3]. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$, $R_0 \in C^2[0, L]$, $0 < R_{\min} \le R_0 \le R_{\max}$, $\{R_{\min}, R_{\max}\} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be given. Moreover let α be such that

$$\alpha < \min\{R_{\min}, (R_{\min} + R_{\max})^{-1}\}. \tag{78}$$

[3] Note that the condition $\alpha \le R_0 + \eta \le \alpha^{-1}$ in (9) avoids the contact of the moving wall with the fixed bottom boundary for $\alpha > 0$.

We define

$$B_\alpha = \{\eta \in \mathcal{Z}\ s.t.\ \eta(y_1,0) = \eta_t(y_1,0) = \eta_{y_1}(y_1,0) = 0,\ \|\eta\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq R_{\min} - \alpha\}. \quad (79)$$

In what follows we show that each $\eta \in B_\alpha$ satisfies properties (9) for sufficiently small time T and small boundary pressures. Indeed, due to $\mathcal{Z} \subset C(0,T;C^1[0,L])$ and the zero initial conditions there exists a time T_α such that it holds

$$\max_{0\leq t\leq T_\alpha,\, 0\leq y_1\leq L} |\eta| = \|\eta\|_{C([0,T_\alpha]\times[0,L])} \leq R_{\min} - \alpha.$$

Then the condition $\alpha \leq R_0 + \eta \leq \alpha^{-1}$ is satisfied for $\eta \in B_\alpha$ and for all $t \leq T_\alpha$, where α is given by property (78).
Moreover since $\eta_t(y_1,0) = \eta_{y_1}(y_1,0) = 0\ \forall y_1 \in [0,L]$, there exists a maximal time T_K such that

$$\int_0^{T_K} |\eta_t(y_1,s)|^2 ds + |\eta_{y_1}(y_1,t)|^2 \leq K \quad \forall y_1 \in [0,L],\ \forall t \in [0,T_K].$$

Thus, each function from B_α fulfills both properties (9) for all $y_1 \in [0,L]$ and sufficiently small time $\tilde{T} = \min\{T_\alpha, T_K\}$. It is an admissible domain deformation in view of our approximation.

In order to apply the Banach fixed point theorem to our mapping $\mathcal{F}$ we have to verify that this mapping is "onto", i.e., $\mathcal{F}(B_\alpha) \subseteq B_\alpha$. Indeed for $\eta^{k-1} \in B_\alpha$ the weak solution obtained using $h = R_0 + \eta^{k-1}$ satisfies the following apriori estimate shown in [LHN16, Section 5, cf. (5.1) and (4.7)],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\boldsymbol{u}^k\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))} + \|\boldsymbol{u}^k\|^2_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(D))} \\
&+\|\eta^k\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(0,L))} + \|\eta^k_t\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(0,L))} + \|\eta^k_t\|^2_{L^2(0,T;H^2(0,L))} \\
&\leq C(\alpha,\alpha^{-1})(1+\mathcal{H}e^{\mathcal{H}}) \left(T\|R_0\|^2_{C^2[0,L]} + \int_0^T \|q_{\partial_D}\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)} \right), \qquad (80)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{H} \leq \int_0^T |\eta^{k-1}_t| + |\eta^{k-1}_t|^2 dt$ for all $y_1 \in [0,L]$ and $\|q_{\partial_D}\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)}$ represents sum the norms of the boundary pressures, i.e., $\|q_{\partial_D}\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)} := \|q_{in}\|^2_{L^2(S_{in})} + \|q_{out}\|^2_{L^2(S_{out})} + \|q_w\|^2_{L^2(S_w)}$. Note, that due to (9) which is fulfilled by all η^k, $k = 1,2,\ldots,$ for $\tilde{T}$ specified above, $\mathcal{H}$ is also uniformly bounded with $\mathcal{H} \leq \sqrt{TK} + K$ for a final time $T \leq \tilde{T}$. Thus estimate (80) is independent of k. Moreover (80) implies that

$$\|\eta^k\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq C(\alpha,\alpha^{-1})(1+(\sqrt{TK}+K)e^{(\sqrt{TK}+K)}) \left(T\|R_0\|^2_{C^2[0,L]} + \int_0^T \|q_{\partial_D}\|^2_{L^2(\partial D)} \right)$$

for $T \leq \tilde{T}$. Therefore, for given α, K, for sufficiently small $\|q_{\partial_D}\|_{L^2(\partial D)}$ and small time $T =: T_{\max} \leq \tilde{T}$ we get $\|\eta^k\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq R_{\min} - \alpha$. Consequently, $\mathcal{F}(B_\alpha) \subseteq B_\alpha$ for small enough final time $T_{\max}$ and small data $\|q_{\partial_D}\|_{L^2(\partial D)}$.

The next step is to verify the contractivity of the mapping $\mathcal{F}$, i.e., to show for $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$, $\sigma_1 := \eta^{1,k-1}$, $\sigma_2 := \eta^{2,k-1}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\sigma_1) = \eta^{1,k}$, $\mathcal{F}(\sigma_2) = \eta^{2,k}$ that

$$\|\mathcal{F}(\sigma_1) - \mathcal{F}(\sigma_2)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq q\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}, \quad \text{where} \quad q < 1. \tag{81}$$

Theorem 3.1 from previous section provides the essential estimate to prove the contractivity. Indeed, (76) implies for $q^1_{in} = q^2_{in}$, $q^1_{out} = q^2_{out}$, $q^1_w = q^2_w$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\eta^{1,k} - \eta^{2,k}\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,t;L^2(D))\cap H^1(0,t;H^2(D))}\\ &\quad\leq C(E,a,b,c)\, C_7\, \omega(t)\|\eta^{1,k-1} - \eta^{2,k-1}\|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(0,t;L^2(D))\cap H^1(0,t;H^2(D))},\end{aligned}$$

where $\omega(t) \downarrow 0$ as $t \downarrow 0$. The constant $C(E,a,b,c)$ depends only on physical data, whereas the constant C_7 depend on K, α, α^{-1}, on $C_h, C_{h,u}$, cf. (47), (68), and on $C^{I.-V.}_\varepsilon$ containing positive powers of $\|\boldsymbol{u}^{i,k}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))}$, $i = 1, 2,$. Due to (80) for $T \leq T_{\max}$ we have $\|\boldsymbol{u}^{i,k}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(D))} \leq R_{\min} - \alpha$, and consequently $C_h = 1 + 2(R_{\min} - \alpha)$ and $C_{h,u} = (1 + 2(R_{\min} - \alpha))(R_{\min} - \alpha)$. Thus C_7 does not depend on k.

Let us moreover note, that the function $\omega(t)$ depending on the norms of the weak solution and its distributive time derivative is for sufficiently small time $T_{\max}$ (specified above) independent on k. Indeed, from the estimate (80) we know that $\|\eta^k\|_{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\boldsymbol{u}^k\|_{L^\infty(0,T_{\max};L^2(D))\cap L^2(0,T_{\max};W^{1,2}(D))}$ are bounded uniformly in k. This implies that the time derivative $\bar{\partial}_t(h\boldsymbol{u}) = \bar{\partial}_t(\eta^{k-1}\boldsymbol{u}^k)$ appearing in $\omega(t)$ is uniformly in k bounded in $L^2(0,T_{\max};X^*)\cap L^{4/3}((0,T_{\max})\times D)$ as well, cf. (10). Indeed, for the boundedness of $\bar{\partial}_t(\eta^{k-1}\boldsymbol{u}^k)$ all remainig terms on the right hand side of (13) have to be estimated independently of k. As an example we show here the estimate for the boundary integral $\int_0^T\int_0^L \eta_t^{k-1}u_2^k\psi_2(y_1,1,t)dy_1dt$. By the assistance of (80) we have for $T \leq T_{\max}$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_0^L \eta_t^{k-1}u_2^k\psi_2(y_1,1,t)dy_1dt\\ &\quad\leq \|\eta_t^{k-1}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(0,L))}\|\psi_2\|_{L^2(0,T;C^1[0,L])}\|\boldsymbol{u}^k\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(D))}\\ &\quad\leq (R_{\min} - \alpha)^2\|\psi_2\|_{L^2(0,T;C^1[0,L])},\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded for all $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in L^2(0,T;X)$, $T \leq T_{\max}$. Analogously one can show the estimates of all remaining terms, which imply uniform boundedness of $\bar{\partial}_t(\eta^{k-1}\boldsymbol{u}^k)$.

We have shown that (81) holds with $q = C(E,a,b,c)C_7\omega(t)$ for sufficiently small $t \leq T_{\max}$ given by the condition $\omega(t) < \frac{1}{C(E,a,b,c)C_7}$. Thus the mapping $\mathcal{F}$ is a contraction.

Finally, the Banach fixed point theorem, see, e.g., [Růž04, Theorem 1.5], implies that for small q_{in}, q_{out}, q_w, sufficiently small time and $0 < \alpha < 1$ satisfying (78) there exists one and only one fixed point $\eta^\star$ of the mapping $\mathcal{F}$ cf. (77), $\eta^\star = \mathcal{F}(\eta^\star)$. Moreover, the iterative process $\eta^k = \mathcal{F}(\eta^{k-1})$ converges, i.e., $\eta^k \to \eta^\star$ in $\mathcal{Z}$. Thus, we have proven that the global iterative method with respect to the domain deformation, used in our numerical approximation of the problem (1)–(8), see [LZ08, HL10, HLR12], converges at least for small boundary pressures q_{in}, q_{out}, q_w and sufficiently small time. In this construction of the solution the contact of the moving wall with the fixed bottom boundary is avoided.

The continous dependence of the fluid velocity $\boldsymbol{u}$ on the domain deformation (Theorem 3.1) and Corollary 3.1 applied for $h = R_0 + \eta^\star$ imply moreover the uniqueness of the weak solution $(\boldsymbol{u}^\star, \eta^\star)$ defined on $\Omega(\eta^\star)$.

Concluding remarks

In [LHN16], [HLN16] we have studied existence of weak solution to the similar fluid-structure interaction problem for shear-dependent fluids with viscosity obeying the power-law $\mu(|e(\boldsymbol{v})|) = \mu(1 + |e(\boldsymbol{v})|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}$ for $p \geq 2$. In that case the corresponding space of weak velocities is $L^p(0,T;W^{1,p}(D))$. Therefore, the norms $\|h_1 - h_2\|$ on the right hand side of estimate (76) would appear with powers 2 and $p' < 2$, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. This leads to a difficult problem, since such an estimate would only imply $\|\mathcal{F}(\sigma_1) - \mathcal{F}(\sigma_2)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq q\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^{p'/2}$, $q < 1$, compare (81). This estimate does not imply the Cauchy-property of the sequence η^k, that is essential for the limiting process $k \to \infty$ in the proof the Banach fixed point theorem and consequently for the existence of a fixed point.

Another challenge is to show the continuous dependence of the weak solution on initial data for a shear-dependent power-law fluid and to generalize the result for Newtonian fluid from [GGP12]. In this case, again, due to the L^p-structure of the fluid velocity, the estimate of the viscous term may cause a difficulty, since except of the p-th power of the gradients of the weak solution it also contains the term $\partial^2_{y_1}(\frac{h^1}{h^2})$, cf. (27), that is only bounded in L^2. Thus, more regularity of the weak solution would be necessary for the corresponding estimates. In this case the so called weak - strong uniqueness would be an interesting tool to study such fluid-structure interaction problems for power-law fluids. This may be a goal of our future work.

Acknowledgment
The author thanks Hana Mizerová for fruitfull discussions on the topic during the preparation of this paper.

The author has been supported by the German Research Foundation DFG, Project No. HU 1885/1-2.

References

[Bei04] H. Beirao da Veiga. On the existence of strong solutions to a coupled fluid-structure evolution problem. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 6:21–52, 2004.

[CDEG05] A. Chambolle, B. Desjardin, M. J. Esteban, and C. Grandmont. Existence of weak solutions for the unsteady interaction of a viscous fluid with an elastic plate. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 7(3):368–404, 2005.

[ČM14] S. Čanić and B. Muha. Existence of a solution to a fluid-multi-layered-structure interaction problem. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 256:658–706, 2014.

[ČM16] S. Čanić and B. Muha. Existence of a weak solution to a fluid-elastic structure interaction problem with the Navier slip boundary condition. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 260(12):8550–8589, 2016.

[CS06] D. Coutand and S. Shkoller. The interaction between quasilinear elasto-dynamics and the Navier-Stokes equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 179(3):303–352, 2006.

[CS10] C. H. A. Cheng and S. Shkoller. The interaction of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations with a moving nonlinear Koiter elastic shell. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(3):1094–1155, 2010.

[Fei93] M. Feistauer. *Mathematical Methods in Fluid Dynamics*. Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics. Longman Scien- tific & Technical, 1993.

[FGNQ00] L. Formaggia, J. F. Gerbeau, F. Nobile, and A. Quarteroni. On the coupling of the 3D and 1D Navier-Stokes equations for flow problems in compliant vessels. Technical Report 3862, INRIA (Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique), 2000.

[FZ08] J. Filo and A. Zaušková. 2D Navier-Stokes equations in a time dependent domain with Neumann type boundary conditions. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 12:1–46, 2010, (published online 2008).

[GGP12] G. Guidoboni, M. Guidorzi, and M. Padula. Continuous dependence on initial data in fluid-structure motions. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 14(1):1–32, 2012.

[GPPB08] M. Guidorzi, M. Padula, P. I. Plotnikov, and N. Bellomo. Hopf solutions to a fluid-elastic interaction model. *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. S.*, 18(2):215–270, 2008.

[Gra08] C. Grandmont. Existence of weak solutions for the unsteady interaction of a viscous fluid with an elastic plate. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 4(2):716–737, 2008.

[HL10] A. Hundertmark Zaušková and M. Lukáčová-Medviďová. Numerical study of shear-dependent non-Newtonian fluids in compliant vessels. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 60:572–590, 2010.

[HLN16] A. Hundertmark, M. Lukáčová-Medviďová, and Š. Nečasová. On the weak solution of the fluid-structure interaction problem for shear-dependent fluid. In *Recent Developments of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics, eds. H. Amann, Y. Giga, H. Kozono, H. Okamoto, M. Yamazaki*, Series of Advanced in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics. Birkhauser Verlag, 2016.

[HLR12] A. Hundertmark-Zaušková, M. Lukáčová-Medviďová, and G. Rusnáková. Fluid-structure interaction interactions for shear-dependent non-Newtonian fluids. In *Topics in Mathematical Modeling and Analysis*, Nečas Center for Mathematical Modeling, Lecture Notes, Vol. 7, Part iV, pages 109–158. MATFYZPRESS Publishing House of the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Prague, 2012.

[Len14] D. Lengeler. Weak solutions for an incompressible, generalized Newtonian fluid interacting with a linearly elastic Koiter shell. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 46(4):2614–2649, 2014.

[Leq11] J. L. Lequeurre. Existence of strong solutions to a fluid-structure system. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(1):389–410, 2011.

[LHN16] M. Lukáčová-Medviďová, A. Hundertmark-Zaušková, and Š. Nečasová. On the existence of weak solution to the coupled fluid-structure interaction problem for non-Newtonian shear-dependent fluid. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 68(1), 2016.

[LR14] D. Lengeler and M. Růžička. Weak solutions for an incompressible Newtonian fluid interacting with a Koiter type shell. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 211:205–255, 2014.

[LZ08] M. Lukáčová-Medviďová and A. Zaušková. Numerical modelling of shear-thinning non-Newtonian flow in compliant vessels. *Int. J. Num. Meth. Fl.*, 56:1409–1415, 2008.

[MČ13a] B. Muha and S. Čanić. Existence of a weak solution to a nonlinear fluid-structure interaction problem modeling the flow of an incompressible, viscous fluid in a cylinder with deformable wall. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 207(3):919–968, 2013.

[MČ13b] B. Muha and S. Čanić. A nonlinear, 3d fluid-structure interaction problem driven by the time-dependent dynamic pressure data: A constructive existence proof. *Communications in Information and Systems*, 13(3):357–397, 2013.

[Nef02] P. Neff. On Korn's first inequality with non-constant coefficients. *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb.: Section A Mathematics*, 132(1):221–243, 2002.

[Neu09] J. Neustupa. Existence of weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equation in a general time-varying domain by the Rothe method. *Math. Method. Appl. Sci.*, 32(6):631–756, 2009.

[Pom03] W. Pompe. Korn's first inequality with variable coefficients and its generalization. *Comment Math. Univ. Carolinae*, 44(1):57–70, 2003.

[QTV00] A. Quarteroni, M. Tuveri, and A. Veneziani. Computational vascular fluid dynamics: problems, models and methods. *Comput. Vis. Sci.*, 2(4):163–197, 2000.

[Qua01] A. Quarteroni. Fluid-structure interaction for blood flow problems. In *Lecture Notes on Simulation of Fluid and Structure Interaction*, AMS-AMIF Summer School, Prague. European Mathematical Society, 2001.

[Růž04] M. Růžička. *Nichtlineare Funktionalanalysis: Eine Einführung.* Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2004.

[Zau07] A. Zaušková. *2D Navier-Stokes equations in a time-dependent domain.* PhD thesis, Comenius University Bratislava, 2007.